

A TREATISE
OF THE SVFFE-
RINGS AND VICTORY
OF CHRIST, IN THE

work of our redemption: Decla-
ring by the Scripturs these
two questions:

*That Christ suffered for vs the wrath of God,
which we may well terme the paynes of Hell,
or Hellish sorrowes.*

*That Christ after his death on the crosse, went
not into Hell in his Soule.*

Contrarie to certaine ettrours in
these points publiklie prea-
ched in London:

Anno 1597.



1598.



621

3
That Christ suffered for
vs the wrath of God: which
we may well terme the *paines*
of Hell, or Hellish sor-
rowes.

TO declare faithfully the *suf-*
ferings of Christ our Savior
which for vs he endured, &
how he cōquered the pow-
er of Hell & Sathan to free
vs therefrō, is a matter for
all Christians (if any other) most worthy
of handling, and necessarie to be known:
Especially now seing of late great iniury
hath bene done by no meane Prelate, to
this point of christiā veritie, in such wise
as no Protestant hath euer done the like
heretofore, neither hath brought more
offence to the godly, or disquietnesto the
Churches in England. Therefore I could
not forbear, though all other, who are
meeter then my self, keepe silēce, but im-
ploe my poore talent in this profitable
seruice for the church of Christ, commit-
ting the whole successe vnto God, whose
holy cause I labour to cleare from all the
corrupt fancies & vaine imaginations of
men in this behalfe.

A s

The

4/4
7/50
1

A TREATISE OF THE

The whole cōtroversie hath in it 2. points
 1. That Christ suffered for vs the wrath of God.
 2. That after his death on the crosse, he went not
 into Hell in his soule.

The former of these is proued most
 soundly & evidently diuers wayes. First
 by a generall reason take from the *sufferings*
of the soule of Christ, then by other *special and*
more immediat arguments, as afterward by
 Gods grace shall well appeare.

A generall
 reason that
 Christ suffe-
 red the wrath
 of God.

Now then for the former thus we say &
 constantlie auowe: *Christ Iesus did suffer in*
his whole manhoode for the redemption and satis-
faction of our sinnes: yea hee suffered properly and
immediatlie in his soule, and not in his fleshe onely.

Therefore he suffered for vs the wrath of GOD.
 This consequent heere is manifest and can
 not bee denied. For what could touche
 the *soule of Christe immediatlie and properly*
 as he suffered and satisfied for our sinnes,
 but the displeasure and iust anger of God
 alone? What els can Christs *soule* bee sub-
 iect vnto *properly and immediatly* in regard
 of sorrowe and affliction, and that for
 sinne? But this *sequele* is not doubted of,
 or if it be, we shal haue occasiō afterward
 to declare it further, The *antecedent*, or
 firste part of the former *generall reason* is
 denied & confidently reiected: yet howe
 falsly by Gods helpe, by that whiche fol-
 loweth, shall easilie appeare.

Wherein it behoueth, that first we con-
 sider, how we meane and holde this asser-
 tion,

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST:

tion, which is namely thus: That Christ suffered in his soule not onely by *Sympathy* or ioint feeling with his body and arising from his body. It is true in deede that so he suffered in his soule, as also mutuallie in his body by *Sympathy* from his soule, for his body els had bene senseles & dull, and without all feeling. But heere we meane that his soule had further some sufferings that were proper and immediatlie risinge in and from the soule: Such as the flesh of Christ no vvayes caused, neither coule fully apprehend. As *fear, sorrow, temptatio, anguish of minde*, a bitter *sense of Gods iust and seuerer wrath*, & all these directly for sinne which he vndertooke on him self for vs.

Howe wee
meane that
Christ suffer-
ed in his
soule.

And this first God willing, shalbe proued. Then after, the contrarie reasons refuted. This then is proued in Mat. 26. 28.

My soule is euery way sorrowfull (perilypos) vnto death, or compassed with sorrowes vnto death.

The antec-
edent of the
generall rea-
son proued.

1.

None will denie but *my Soule* heere is properly the very humane soule of Christ. Also it is plaine, this grieuous passion was in his soule *immediatlie and properly*, not growing by any hurt of his flesh, seeing then his bodye was not touched with anie smart. And lastly that this was for the bitter punishment of our sinnes which hee nowe directlie susteined in his *soule*, and yet was further to susteyne, we ought not by anie reason to doubt. For lette vs mark: the whole text here, and in all the

Euangelists doth shew that the only matter he was now going about, and especially troubled withall, was the verie sufferings of him selfe as man for vs, the full sacrifice & sinne offering of our redemption. Nothing els now appeareth in the text to haue disquieted him. Wherefore also he saith, *Father, saue me from this bower. Lett this cuppe passe from me: if it be possible lett this cuppe passe from me.* What if hee also had care and compassion for his countreyemen the Iewes? What, if he forgot not his *Apostles and poore Church*, now to be left behinde as sheepe amongst Wolfes? Doeth that hinder or diminishe this his passion for sinne? Or doe not these wordes and other circūstances of the text declare, that now chiefly, yea only, he was troubled about his *suffering for our sinne*. His care of his *Apostles and Church* he vnburthened him selfe of, *Iohn 17.* a little before he entred into this conflict of his passion *Iohn 18. 1.* That for *Ierusalem and the Iewes* he was particularlie touched withall not longe before, *Mat. 23. 37. & cap. 24.* So that those affections do seme there to haue their proper place. And the time after appeareth, namely in the garden & on the crosse, to be left chiefly, yea only, for his sorrowes & sufferings for the redemption of sinnes. Thus then let no man thinke it presumption to say expressly what did nowe in this sort greue the Lorde, and cause in him this heauines. Him selfe we see telleth vs expressly,

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

presslie, therefore we may expresse say it:
This his bitter of suffering for sinne, *This cuppe*
 of affliction and sorrowe which nowe he
 felt and was to feele yet further, caused
 him so to mourne and feare. If you say, It
 was a passion in deede of the soule, it was
 sorrow, it was feare, and much heauines,
 & that for our sins, but yet it was direct-
 lie *because* of his bodilie death & torments
 which were nowe *neere* at hand. Or els he
 feared in deede Gods wrath towards him
 for sins, but he felt it not. I answer, 1. That
 former is not so: It is no lesse then impi-
 ous to affirme that only his bodilie death
 and outward paines should so terrifie and
 dismay him: as in the next more speciall
 arguments we shall further declare. 2. A-
 gaine, he both *feared* and *felt* Gods anger
 for the sinne of the worlde: as also in the
 said speciall argumentes we shall see fur-
 ther. But this obserue nowe: yet this first
 general reason is graunted. If this in deed
 were feare of Gods wrath, then *Christ suffer-*
ed for our finnes properlie and immediatlie in his
soule, not in his fleshe onely. * He feared, he had
 sorrow, astonishment, miserie, and much
 anguillie of minde, & that for our finnes.
 Nowe whether this were onely Feare or
 what so euer more, this is cleare and cer-
 ten, Christ had these sufferinges in his
 soule *properly*, and from his soule *immediat-*
lie, as being the sufferings for our finnes.

Obiections

Answers

* *Lypa, perly-
 pas, setarastai,
 eThambei-
 sthai, ade-
 monin, &c.*

But for all this there is doubt hereof

* 1. Pet. 2. 24.

† Col. 1. 20.

* verſe 23.

† Rom. 7. 4.

* Reuel. 5. 9.

† 1. Iohn. 4. 7.

in ſome, becauſe it is written, * *Hee bare our ſinnes in his body on the tree.* † *He reconciled vs by the blood of his croſſe.* * *He reconciled vs in the body of his fleſh through death.* † *We are dead to the law by the body of Chriſt.* * *He redeemed vs to God by his blood.* † *The blood of Chriſt cleanſeth vs from all our ſinnes.* This is a coſtant phraſe throughout the ſcriptures, attributing our whole remiſſion of ſinnes to the bodily ſufferinges of Chriſt only and to his bloodſhed, and not to anie thing of the ſoule. If all theſe places of ſcripture ſhould bee figuratiue, noting but the parte for the whole, Chriſtes body, when there is meant his ſoule too, they are ſtrange figures that runne alwayes ſo, Gods worde neuer yeelding anye one ſuch proper ſpeech throughout the ſcripture, that Chriſt ſuffered for vs in his ſoule. I anſwer: Firſt, the meaning of thoſe places is to aſcribe our whole remiſſion of ſinnes only to Chriſt & his ſufferings: and to exclude all other means without or beſides Chriſt, but not to exclude any parte of Chriſte, though only ſome parte be mentioned. 2. Therefore vve ſay further: Theſe places of ſcripture are not proper and literal, but figuratiue in deede: they doe note but the parte for the whole, ſometimes Chriſtes body, ſometimes his fleſh, ſometimes his blood, when the whole man Chriſt is plainlie vnderſtoode conſiſting both of a body hauinge fleſh and blood, and alſo of a ſoule. Otherwiſe we muſt ſaye, Theſe very ſcriptures before mentioned, are at open iarre in theſelues, if we take them literally. Some ſay
his

Answer.

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

his body, some his blood cleanseth vs from all sin. Againe, his body on the tree only did beare our sinnes, and his sufferings of all his life before were not meritorious nor helpfull at all for vs, not his pouertie, nor his shame, nor his being rayled vpon, nor any his persecutions before his very death on the tree. For so these places sound being literally & strictly vnderstood: which how false it is, I need not, I hope to declare. In like sort it is said, *The figure that saueth vs is Baptisme*. What? Therefore doth baptisme saue vs only? Doth not the Lords supper? Doth not the word preached also? *The word was made flesh*: was it onely made flesh and not a humane soule to? In the dayes of his flesh he offered vp prayers and supplications with stronge cryes. Was it not in the dayes when he had both flesh & soule also? He tooke not the seede of Angels but he tooke the seed of Abraham. He tooke humane flesh & soule to, did he not? Let not sinne raigne in your mortall bodyes: I hope he meaneth neither in our soules nor bodyes *Sacrifice & offering thou wouldest not haue: but a body thou ordainedst me*: yea both a body and a soule too. The fornicator sinned against his our body, & no lesse surely against his soule also. It were infinit to shew you the phrases of scripture, which in speaking of the outward parte onely, yet alwayes they signifie the intire & whole man. The reason wherof, especially in Christs sufferings, doth seeme to be this, because the wounds of his body & sheading forth of his blood, are most aparant & euident to sense:

and

and therefore are they so commonly named in stead of the whole sufferings, the rest whereof were not open to our senses. Againe, because *his bodily death on the crosse*, and his *shedding of blood* there, was the finall accomplishment of all his sufferings whatsoever. Therefore this in stead of all the rest is vsuallie named, and yet the rest neuer excluded. Howbeit for all this, note further, that we read the *serie phrase* literalie and expresse *Isai 53. 10. He made his soule sinne*, or a sacrifice for sinne: The full meaning whereof shalbe more declared by & by in the next prooffe of this general reason. Also where it is said, *He was broken for our sinnes*: it can not be properlie meant of Christes body, his flesh and bones. For it is written, *not a bone of his was broken*: Wherefore the meaning is, The sorrowes & torments of his soule did *bruse* and *breake him to pieces*, as the truth sheweth he was, and became for vs in deede. If any reply, *The nayles and speares did breake him*: Nay, they *pearced him*. But in no sort can that be called *breaking* or *brusing to pieces*, as the former word doth plainlie signifie.

• *Medusa.*

• *Objection.*

Further it is objected, The old sacrifices of the Iewes were figures of our whole & absolute redemption by Christ. But they signified no more but his bodily sufferings onely. Therefore Christes sufferings for our redemption were only bodily.

• *Answer.*

I answer, First the *proposition* is false, taking

king it generallie. The carnall *sacrifices* of the Iewes signified that which they were apt to teach and signifie: but not any further. Therefore they signified that the redemption of men should haue a true bodily sacrifice with the sheading of blood: yea whatsoeuer was carnall & sensible in it might be signified by them. But not the inward and invisible thinges that did necessarily concur in and with this bodily sacrifice: for the which those carnal types were altogether vnfit, neither had they any resemblance together. As first the meritorious sacrifice must haue of necessitie the *Deitie* conioyned in person with it. This sacrifice must bee the body & blood of God; or els it could neuer satisfie, nor deserue the fauour of God for the worlde. But the sacrifices of beasts could not prefigure this personall vnion of God and man in the true sacrifice together. Therefore they signified not all the necessarie pointes in the meritorious sacrifice. Again those *beasts* sacrifices could not prefigure the immortall & reasonable soule of Christ: whiche it was necessarie hee should haue to be our redeemer. Thirdly it was necessarie that this sacrifice of our full redemption, should not only dye, but also reuiue again: euen the victorious resurrection of his flesh from death was necessarie. As it is written, *He died for our sinns, and rose againe for our iustification.* But the sa-
crifi-

crificed beastes neither could nor did signifie any such thing. Therefore the *propositio* before is false, *The olde sacrifices of the Iewes were not resemblances & figures of our whole and absolute redemption by Christ.* They serued only to represent such partes therof as they were apt and fit to teach and signifie. Secondly, I deny the *assumption* before going also. The Iewes sacrifices, that is certaine of them, did signifie more then the *bodily* sufferings onely, they set forth the sufferings of the *soule* of Christ also. In the 16. chapt. of *Leuit.* Verse 5. we haue a *sinne offering* consisting of Two Goates, the one *slayne*, the other the *scape goate*: yet both of them a *sacrifice for sinne*, as the text speaketh. What doeth the *slayne Goate* figure but the *body* of Christ *slayne*, the *scape-goate* the *soule* which also *bare our sinnes*, and was a *sinne offering*, but yet suruiued and dyed not as the body of Christ did. The *scape-Goate* heere surelie muste of necessitie signifie the *Soule* or the *Deitie* of Christ. The *Deitie* it can not signifie, because that can not bee a *sinne offering*. Therefore it signifieth that the *immortall Soule* of Christ was a *sinne offering*: and being a sinne offering, or a sacrifice for sinne, it did properlie beare our sinns, and suffer for our sinnes.

If any saye, *This scape-goate* suffered not as the *slayne goate* did, but was *sent away* free and vntouched. Thus then the Soule of Christ

Christ must scape and not suffer when his body suffered.

I answer. The *scaping* of this Goate may signifie the *Soules immortallitie*, whiche died not when the body dyed. But that it suffered in that kinde which the soule can suffer, it is manifest by this, that it was an offering or sacrifice for sinne, and bare our sinnes as well as the body, which is like the slain Goate, whiche sensibly and apparauntlie died. Againe, the sacrifice in *Leuit. chap. 6* called the *Holocaust*, or *whole burnt offering*, doeth liuelie prefigure the sufferinge of the *whole Manhood* of Christ for our sinnes, that is both in his soule and bodye. For in other sacrifices *certain partes* of the sacrifices were reserued and not burnt. But in this *the whole*, and euery whit being chopt and cut into pieces, it was *altogether* put into the fire, and burnt: and so it was by a speciall name called The *whole burnt offering*. Euen so, not the body onely, but also the Soule of Christ, euen euery whitt, of his humanitie, was burnt and consumed in the fier of affliction, as a perfect *Holocaust* and a whole burnt offeringe for our sinnes.

By this we may easely see the answer to a like obiection of the *Sacramentes* of the newe Testament: When they saye, In them, like as in the Iewes sacrifices, nothing else is represented and signified, but

Obiection.

but the bodily sufferinges of Christ: Wee are to answere as we did before. These are giuen of God to the Church to teach and represent that which they are apte and fit by their nature for, They are bodily and earthlie elementes: and therefore fit to set forth bodilie and aparant effectes in Christ: they can not set out the spirituall and inuisible effectes in him. And yet the ceremonie of *breaking the bread*, which is to shewe forth how Christes body was broke for vs, it can not belong properlie to the body, but to the soule, and to the body by sympathy with the soule, as is before declared.

2. I proceed further to the second prooffe of this generall reason: *Isay 53. 10. The Lord will breake him and make him subiect to infirmities, when he shall make his soule sinne*, that is to say, a sacrifice for sinne. Here first we may note a plaine expresse phrase, the verie letter sounding that *his soule was made sinne*, or a sacrifice for sinne: Neither is there anie yrgent reason why soule heere should be so figured or disfigured: rather, that the humane soule should bee wholly excluded. I denie not but *his soule* heere doeth signifie himselfe, that is his humane nature intierlie and wholly. And that may bee notably shewed by comparinge the phrase in the Apostle to the very same purpose, *2. Cor. 5. 21. He hath made him sinne for vs whiche knewe no sinne, that we might bee made the righteousness of God in him*. Heere that whiche the Prophet

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 15.

What meaneth saying, *He made his soule sinne*, the same the Apostle meaneth sayinge, *God made Him sinne for vs*. That is to say, him selfe wholly as man, not any one parte of him onelie. And this is literall. If any yet doubt, howe Christ was made *sinne* for vs in his soule, you may plainlie see heere in *Paule*. For he compareth *Christes being sinne* for vs who knewe no sinne, and our being the righteousnes of God in him, who haue *no righteousnes in our selues. As if he should say, *In like manner*, He hath borne our sinnes, as we haue receyued his righteousnes. But wee attaine the righteousnes of GOD by him both in our soules and bodyes: So likewise then, He was made sinne for vs, both in his soule & body. Otherwise this *similitude* or *comparison* were vneuen, and namely short on his parte, whiche ought not to be. Therefore surely, he was made sinne for vs (here in *Paule*) and *his soule* was made sinne (in *Esaie*,) signifieth *Hee himselfe* was, that is intirelie in both partes he was a sacrifice for sinne, euen *his soule and body*. As also the other phrase here in *Esaie*, *He was broken*, doeth likewise prooue, as I haue enough declared thereof before.

No iustifying
righteousnes.

Thirdlie, I proue this generall reason from *11 Ieb. 2*. where *the ende & reason why* destroy through death him that had the power of death, that is the Diuell. 15. And that he might deliver all them, which for feare of death were all their life time subiect to bondage. 16 For he in no sorte tooke on him the Angell, but he tooke the seed of Abraham. 17 Wherefore it behoued him in all things to be made like his brethren, &c.

Christ

Christ tooke on him the nature of man, is plainlie opened. He is said (verse 16.) *not to haue taken the Angels nature, but mans*: even for this very cause & purpose, that he might suffer in that nature which he assumed, & by suffering in it he might saue it. Now he assumed (all men know) our humane *soule* aswell as our flesh, and he saued our *soule* aswell as our flesh, *ergo* he suffered both in *soule* and in flesh: and the Angels nature hee would not assume nor suffer in it, because he would not saue it. This reason is better concluded thus: If he assumed our whole humane nature to this very *end* & *purpose* that he might suffer in it, and by suffering in it, saue it: Then he also suffered both in body and in *soule*. But this is true, Hee assumed our whole humane nature to this verie *end* and *purpose*, that he might suffer in it, and by suffering in it, saue it, *Ergo* this is true also, that hee suffered both in *soule* and fleshe. Heere onely the *assumption* can be doubted. It conteyneth in it three points.

1. He assumed our whole humane nature.
2. That which he assumed he did assume to this very end & purpose, that he might suffer in it.
3. That by suffering in it he might saue it.

These three pointes being proued, the whole *Assumption* before is euident and firme. But they are all proued in these verses of Heb. 2. as the First, Verse, 14, 16, 17.

Nei-

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 17

Neither doeth this let, that he speaketh, namely but of *fleshe and blood*, vers. 14. and of the *seede of Abraham* verse 16. It can not be doubted but these phrases are set downe *synecdochicos*, the part for the whole; and so the Author meaneth here, he assumed the *whole* humane nature. The *seconde* is proued verse 14, 15, 17, 18. The *thirde* is proued verse 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

If anie reply here, it is true no man euer Objection. doubted, but Christ suffered in his soule; that is by *sympathy* or ioint feeling fro his body, according to the course of nature in him: but not as properly making to mans redemption, & so this, to the *Hebrewes*, here is to be vnderstoode.

Nay: that hath no reason in it. Christ Answer. assumed not our nature, nor any parte of it, but onely to suffer in it *properly* and *immediatlie*, euen for the very purchasing of our redemption thereby. Otherwise hee had no neede to assume both, but either the one parte or the other. I say, if the *proper and immediate suffering* in one part of our nature onely, had bene sufficient to saue vs wholly, then there was no simple necessitie that Christ should assume both parts. For if God so would, and nothing but natures perfection and sufficiencie had bin respected, then the assuming of one parte onely and the suffering in it, by this pretended reason, might haue bene able to haue saued vs *wholy* thorough the infinite
B excel.

*Apollinaris
Heresie.*

Heb. 2. 14 &c.

excellencie of that person hauing the Diuine nature conioyned with it to supplie the vn sufficiencie of the Humane single parte, either in doing or suffering. Thus *Apollinaris heresie* will enter at this gap. Hee held that Christ assumed humane *fleshe* indeed, but not any humane *soule*. For it needed not, said he. His *Deitie* being sufficient to be in steed of a *soule* in supplyinge vnto it all efficacie for naturall operations, and consequentlie so farre to giue assistance to the *Flesh* that it might be able to doe all things for our redemption without the *soule*, only through the helpe of the Godlie power ioyned therewith: As namely it could *quicken* it, and make it *mooue*, and *liue*, and haue *knowledge*, and *feeling*, &c. Therefore his *flesh* onely thorough the quickening and mouing of his *Godhead* might do the workes of righteousness, & suffer feelinglie the paynes sufficient for our iustifying and sauinge: and all this without a humane *soule*. So that the *soule* should bee superfluous & needles, which should *properlie* doe nothing in the worke of our redemption. And if it were superfluous and needles in Christ, how shall we hold that he had anie at all. Whiche *blasphemie* God forbid. Therefore it is vaine to replie, and very false, that here *is meant, that Christ suffered in *soule* by *sympathie* only, or a naturall suffering, when as this suffering *properlie* did not make to our redemption, nor was

was absolutely necessarie to make Christs
Flesh to haue life and sense: the Soules
immediat and proper suffring was necessarie
to make it a ransome for sinne, and there-
fore we conclude that here this is special-
lie signified.

Moreouer they obiekt: That wherby A- Obiect
dam propagated sin into vs, by the same
hath Christ procured satisfaction for vs.
But Adam propagated sinne into vs *not by*
our soules but only by our flesh which only wee
deriue frō him: Therefore Christ *only by his*
flesh and not by his soule hath procured satis-
faction for vs. To this we answered sim-
ply by denying the *proposition*. By the same
instrumēt Adam did not propagate sinne
into vs by whiche Christ satisfied for vs.
For Adam propagated and deriued sinne
into vs, only by the flesh (supposing now
that our soules are immediatly infused by
God, & come not from our parents.) But
Christ satisfied for vs both in his soule &
flesh. Wherefore in this sense we denie the
propositio as being vtterly false. And in steed
of this false argument I retorne against it
this reason better grounded and of certen
trueth. *That wherby Adam firste and wee euer*
since doe most properly commit sinne, by the same
hath Christ our second Adam made satisfaction
for our sinne. But Adam first & we euer since most
properly commit sinne in our soules, our bodyes be-
ing but the instrumentes of our Soules, and
folowing the soules direction and will.

Ansi

Rom. 5.19.

Therefore Christ in his soule chiefly and most properly made satisfaction for vs. Against this conclusion there can not by any reason, be a nic deniall. All which as in it self it is most certen, so also it may wel be gathered and grouded on the Apostle: *Like as by one mans disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one shall many also be made righteous.* Where though chiefly the Apostle compareth Adams disobedience with Christs obedience as both doe reach vnto vs: yet it is plaine he doeth iointlie signifie the Subiect also of their disobeying and obeying, that is their soule, wherein they properlie wrought these thinges whiche did reach euen vnto vs. So that hence we reason thus: *Wherein Adam disobeyed and Christ obeyed, by the same hee satisfied for vs and made vs righteous. But Adam disobeyed God, and Christ obeyed principally in the soule. Therefore principally and chiefly in his soule Christ satisfied for vs, & made vs righteous.* The proposition onely is in question, which here is plainlie gathered from the Apostle: and so both our Assertion is proued, and their proposition before confuted. Now all this we answered graunting that mens soules are not deriued by propagation from their parentes. Which yet if any affirmed, there could follow no impietie nor absurditie: neither reason nor religion can well ouerthrowe it. And thus also their assumption before is flatlie denied, Howbeit for my parte I will not fall

fall into this questiō here, being very difficult and not simply necessarie, *Whether our soules come by generation, as the body doeth, or no.* Because I content my selfe with the opiniō of the most at this present, who being excellent learned and godly men denie this point, and yet notwithstandinge for all that the former *assumption* may bee denied also. For who knoweth not that the soule is the proper and perpetual *Subiect* of sinne? So that where there is no liuing soule, there neuer was nor cā be any sinne or disobedience at all. The fleshe therefore being not capable of sinne and disobedience, but by the soule and frō the soule (in the which alwayes it is properlie inhærent, if it be at all;) And sinne beeing properly a spirituall qualitie alwayes, and no corporall pollution: it wil follow that Adam propagated sin into vs † *by our soules* Zanchius de Oper. Deū and not by our flesh onely, whether our soules come by propagation, or infusion, or howe so euer. Yet if any sticke at this, howe sinne can be deriued in propagatiō by and in the soule, if the soule be not deriued also. Lett vs not bee curious in this harde point, which needeth more *Philosophie* then *Diuinitie* to declare it: holdinge fast this most eident trueth, that *sinne* is a proper and vnseparable qualitie of the soule, and can not be found being in anie thing where a reasonable soule is wāting. And therefore it is not deriued from our

parents in Flesh onely but in a Soule also, the Soule beeing euer vnited to the flesh when so euer it is sinfull. As for the *fleshes sinne*, wee denie that it sinneth properly: but onely it partaketh of sinne from the soule by ioyning with it and depending on it.

Obiect.

Further it is sayed, If Christes bodilie death satisfie not, for the sinne of our soules, then we haue no good by Christes bodily death. For *our bodyes*, saye some, *haue no good at all by Christes death, no more then the bodyes of Infidels: seeing we dye still as well as they.* But wee haue much good no doubt by Christes bloodshed and *meere* bodilie death. Therefore the sinne of our Soules is purged thereby. And if so, then that *his soule* should also suffer for vs, is superfluous.

Answer.

The answer is: First that is presumed which is most false, That we precisely say that Christes *body* satisfied for our bodyes and his *soule* for our soules, yea each of the in a seuerall and distinct kinde of satisfying: so that the sufferings of the one profited not at all for the other, but *his body* for *our bodyes* and *his soule* for *our soules*. Whiche thing we neuer meant: but acknowledge the sufferings of the *whole man Christ* doe satisfie for vs *wholy*, without any such precise partition. Neuertheles we knowe by Gods worde, and doe affirme, that God in his iustice regarded this proportion, that

as

as we haue sinned both in our Bodyes & Soules, so he that was made our propitiation did purposely and answerably suffer both in his Body and Soule. I say answerably to the proportion of our sinning.

Now if anie with respect to this proportion do say, Christs Body suffered for our bodyes, his Soule for our soules, then is it a godlie and wholesome saying, neither giueth it anie euill sequele at all. But further then so, we meane not, we allowe not. Secondly the proofof the firste proposition what

Paradoxe is it, yea what impietie? *Haue our Bodyes no good at all by Christes death, no more then the bodyes of Infidells, because wee Dye still as well as they?* Lett vs consider this point:

our Bodyes haue manifolde benefites by Christes death. 1. Sinne is not imputed against vs at all, yea wee are clothed with Christes righteousness both in our bodyes and soules, when we are once iustified by faith in his death. 2. Sinne is abated and mortified in vs daylie, and righteousness is begunne and increased euen in our bodyes, by the vertue of his Death and resurrection apprehended & applyed by faith. 3 Our bodyes now haue assurance of a glorious resurrection through his death and resurrection. 4. Our bodyes are made the true owners of our bodily food, clothing, riches, and other comforts, whereof the Wicked are but vsurpers. Yet you will say, *Wee dye still, as well as the Infidells.*

† *Yea so farre forth a proportion was held in all respectes as the possibility of things could admit: at anon after is further shewed pag. 26. 27.*

What good our very Bodyes haue by Christes death.

†The proper
punishment for
sinne is not
layd vpon two:
not vpon
Christ, and
vs also.

The scripture saith *Nay*: if you meane Death *the curse of the Lawe* and *the punishment of sinne*. He was made sinne for vs, that is, Hee rooke the punishment of sinne for vs. And Christ redeemed vs from the curse of the Lawe, being made a Curse for vs. 5. Therefore death, yea bodily death, as it is *the stipend of sinne*, as the punishment of sinne, So * Hee hath taken it from vs, and vs from it, and we are freed by his death: yea vnto vs it is nowe cleane changed, & not the same in it own nature as it was. It is to vs the passinge to heauen, and a thinge to bee prayed for. whiche the punishment of sinne can not be. *I desire to be dissolued and to bee with Christe*, sayeth the Apostle. And therefore the scripture taketh the name of death from this departure of the godly: *He that beleueth in me shall not see death: and hee hath now passed from death to life*. Thus then, haue not our bodies any good at all, any more the the bodies of infidels? God forbid: This is a mooste vnchristian speech. Lastly to answer to the former reason directlie. It is said, *If Christes bodily death satisfie not for the sinne of our soules, then haue we no good by it*. First let vs know distinctlie what is meant here by Christes bodily death. Wee meane his meere bodily death, and that say we, beeing but a parte of his mooste meritorious passion satisfied not for our sinnes. The whole abundantlie satisfied, no one parte or piece thereof doeth satisfie: because what GOD

hath

hath iyned together, let no man so wickedlie separate.

But you will replie, his *onely* blood shed, his bodily death *meere*ly was sufficient, yea *one* drop of his blood, beeing the blood of the sonne of God, was sufficiēt to redeeme a thousande worldes.

That we denie: howbeit we reason not what it might haue bene, if GOD had so appointed: we speake not thereof. We say onely what it was, and is. That only *is sufficient* in deed, which God hath appointed to suffice for the satisfaction of our sinns. God hath appointed *both the sufferings of his soule and also of his body*. Likewise all those sufferinges *in his life*, aswell as *at his death*. Therefore *all these somethie are sufficient*, but *no parte of them severallie*. So that *† to saye one drop only* of Christes blood was simply sufficient for all our sinnes: I holde it a presumptuous & vngodly speech, whiche so mainlie crosseth the appointmēt of God, and his reuealed will. As is partlie before declared, and shalbe hereafter more fully. Further it doeth flatlie crosse the moste perfect *ius*tice and the *loue* of God: both which together, that is, *ius*tice with *loue*, and *loue* with *ius*tice must needes stand intire & sounde, and not a whitt impayred in the mysterie of our redemption. 1. *Ius*tice requireth that the same nature shoulde satisfie for sinne whiche properly committed the sin. But our soule properlie, chief-
lie

† One onely drop of Christes blood in deed not sufficient for the redemption of the world.

lie, and immediatlie sinned. Therefore Christes Soule should properlie, chieflie, and immediatlie paye the price thereof. 2. It is not proportionable with *iustice*, that an easier punishment should satisfie for a greater sinne, where it is possible that it may bee had. But the Soule of Christ possibly might haue suffered *properlie* and *immediatlie*. Therefore in *iustice* it must and did suffer, and not his bodye onely.

Note.

Obiect.

Answer.

If anye saye, Christes *verbe bodilie* sufferings were so grievous and vehement, as that they were comparable to the Soules sufferings, if it had *properlie* indured any. Nay, that hath no reason: the *flesh* is not capable, neither of like righteousnes nor sinne, neither of such ioyes nor punishments according to the capacitie of the *soule*: there is no equall measure betweene these. Nowe this prise equally in *iustice* must be kept so farre as it is possible in all satisfactions. Therefore here in this it was kept: and how in this it was kept in deed, we shall more cleerely perceiue in the other more *speciell arguments* hereafter following. Therefore it behoued Christes soule to suffer for vs *properlie*, as well as his body.

Obiect.

If any say, It was Gods singular *loue* to his most deare sone to quit him of those extremest torments *the sufferings of his soule*, and to admit a *Dispensation* in steed of *Compensation*, that is to be satisfied with lesse then God might haue exacted of Christ, & lesse then

he

he could haue yeelded. 1. This belonges properly to the sitting of our more special arguments hereafter, where we shall see into it further. 2. Gods *loue* must not impaire his *iustice*, but both must stande intire and perfect together in our redemption, as is aboue said, or els we destroy the nature of God. But by this deuise gods *iustice* which might be executed by Christs suffering in his soule, shrinketh, and is shortned not a litle, by reason of his *loue* to Christ which inflicteth not al the punishmēt (say they) which being due to our sins, Christ also as man might feele, & his Father might laye vpon him. Nay this, in this case is no *loue* but *partialitie*. But † this is the *loue of God* in this mysterie, euē that which he sheweth vnto vs, his *iustice* being layd vpon Christ. I say his *loue* is to vs: in that he hath translated our guiltines frō vs vpon Christ his own sonnes person, & beaten our fault vpon his back. This is the most gracious & heauenly *loue* of God to be blessed & magnified for euer: & not that he spared his sonn in paying our ransome more thē the possibilitie of *iustice* would that he should. For so a lesse and a farre lighter humiliatio of Christ then his bodily death also, might as well haue satisfied God for vs. I say, what needed those moſte pitiefull and wofull bodily woundes, & smarting stripes, somuch bloodshed being so precious, yea that vnderferued sundring of body & soule by cruell death? Nay more then this, what neded al those

† Gods *loue* in
ordayninge
Christs suffer-
ings, what it
is in truth

those penuries, ignominies, persecutions and other miseries in his life time, which he plenteously sustained? When as some one or few such as Christ suffered, yea his incarnation only might haue bin enough & enough meritorious in that diuine person to appease his fathers wrath, if in his fatherlie *loue* he meant to *dispense* and laye lesse then the full waight & burden of our sinnes on him. All those *superfluities of sufferings which Christ did most painfullie endure, howe stande they with this infinite loue of God towards his moste deare and tenderly beloued sonne, if they needed not at all, if this his *loue* might *dispense* with his *iusstice*? We can neuer auoyd this absurde and irreligious consequent.

**Yea: Neither the Loue nor Iustice of God could lay more on Christ then was sufficient. But God laide more on him then the shedding of one drop of blood: Therefore one drop was not sufficient.*

Obiection.

Answer.

Now then will you reply and say, Thus wee doe make the *meere* bodily death and bloodshed of Christ not profitable, nor meritorious, if we will not yeeld them to satisfie for sinne. That is vnttrue: We know and professe they are *most profitable* and *meritorious*, yea lesser sufferings then those, as his *povertie*, his *hatred*, his *shame*, and *ignominy*, &c. these were *all most profitable* and *meritorious* and *satisfactorie* also to our saluation. But as an Armie of souldiours doe *all together* gette the victorie and not any one of them asunder, and yet for all that *each one* singly is profitable in fight for the attainment of victorie: euen so these Suffrings of Christ both of his body and of his soule

In his body and of his soule all

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 29

All together do sufficientlie merite, but each one in severall is profitable and helpeth therevnto.

To these proofes before handled, let vs adde one or two more briefly in this wise. If Christ were emptyed & abased to the uttermost that might be, then he was afflicted in his soule properly and immediatlie as well as in his bodye. But he was in deed emptyed and abased, exinanited, to the utmost that might be. Therefore he was afflicted properly and immediatlie, yea most bitterly in his soule. Where this worde in the Apostle, he tempted him selfe, doth testifie, he was so farre cast downe in his humiliation, that he was cleane voyde of all comfort and dignitie, before his exaltation to ioy & glorie: Which by no meanes can be possible true in plaines of speech, (that he was emptyed) if the soule were vntouched, and felte not such humiliatio at Gods hand wherof it was properlie capable. And as for an hyperbole or phrase larger the the meaning is in this place, ther is no cause for any to dreame thereof.

† Hebr. 10.
ekenison.
Phil. 2. 7.

Againe thus I reason: He Offered him selfe thorough the Eternall Spirit. What signifieth Him selfe here but his whole Humanitie, even his body and soule, to bee the Sacrifice of redemption which hee offered to GOD through the vertue of his Death? Therefore seing his soule also was the sacrifice, his soule suffered also as well as his body.

Hebr. 9. 14

Lastly, if both the body & soule of Christ were

the

6.

the Tabernacle of his Deitie wherein hee performed his sacrifice for sinne, Then hee suffered properly as well in his soule as in his body.

* Heb. 8. & 9.
Col. 2. 9.

But the Tabernacle of Christes Deitie wherein hee performed his sacrifice, was both * his soule and body. Therefore hee suffered properly both in soule and in body.

* Heb. 8. 2.
and 9. 11.

Where we haue to cōsider these points: 1. Touchinge the Iewish Tabernacle, Moses sheweth that the typicall Priestes offered vp therein their sacrifices for recōciliation to God. 2. Christes manhood is * called by the holy ghost the Tabernacle of his godhead: that is, he maketh it answerable in Christ in trueth to the typicall Tabernacle, wherein the Iewish priesthood sacrificed. 3. His manhood here is meant his whole & intire manhood, not any one part thereof, but both his soule and body iointly, & the same to be † this Tabernacle of his Deitie, * wherein the Godhead dwelt bodily. 4. That Christ offered vp his sacrifice of redemption in this Tabernacle, y is, in his whol & intire māhood

† Heb. 9. 11.
* Col. 2. 9.

So that hence our reason is good: If all these poincts be true, & if Christ thus offered his sacrifice for sin both in his soule and body, then he suffered properly both in his soule & body, & not in one part only. But al these points are true, as our assumption importeth, and are manifestly proued by Cōparing Moses institution of that Iewish Tabernacle with this spirituall application thereof, not to the flesh onelie but

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

31

† Heb. 2. & 9.

but to the [†] whole humanitie of Christ.

Therefore the Conclusion is firme: Neither can any thing be stood at vnles some will saye, Christes flesh onely and not his Soule also is the *true Tabernacle* of the God-head. Which amongst all wise Christians is to absurde.

Obiection.

* Gal. 6, 14

Yet that of the Apostle is alleadged & obiected earnestly: ** God forbid that I should reioyce but in the Crosse of Christ Iesus.* Here euē all and the whole Sufferings of Christ are signified, for in nothing els would Paule reioice, but euē herein. Howbeit the *Crosse* conteyneth not any sufferings of Christs Soule, his Soule was not crucified but his Body onely. Therefore his Body onely suffered, and not his Soule. I answer, It is true, this is not only an obiection, but even a foundation and principall ground of this errour: but so mistaken & forced, as nothing may be more. So that by overthrowing this, the whole Conclusion will fail. 1. If Paul had here meant the very *personall* sufferings of Christ, why might not *the Crosse* conteyne his Soules sufferings, yea al the Suffrings of Christs whole life? What letteth but his Soule might be sayd to be Crucified, & not the Flesh only? Any bitter anguish & sharp affliction is commonly called, a Crosse. And though *Christs Crosse* properly & strictly taken was, sensible & outward in deed, yet who seeth not but it is most familiarly & often vsed in a larger

Answer.

larger meaning, to conteyne all Christes
grievous Sufferinges what so euer, when
so euer, & how so euer: euen like as is ob-
served before † against the first obiection
against vs in the beginnunge. 2. Neuer-
theles I take it to be cleare, that this Text
is further mistaken. The Apostle heere
speaketh not of the *personall* sufferinges of
Christ, but of the godly, Christs members:
which they suffer for Christs trueth sake,
which are also called *the afflictions of Christ*.
For hauing a litle before noted the False
teachers, whiche mingled and corrupted
Gods trueth, because so they might bet-
ter scape *persecution*, which they were loth
to suffer *for the Crosse of Christ*, that is, for
the sincere doctrine whiche commonlie
bringeth the Crosse with it: Now there
he presentlie Opposeth his owne vpright
and faithfull affection, sayinge, Nay, *God*
forbid, that we who are the true Ministers of
God, *should ioy in anie thing but in this* that
these men doe abhorre, that is, euen *in af-*
fections for Christ and for his sincere trueth,
when God calleth vs therevnto: Whiche
in deed is a singular note of the true Mi-
nisters of God. Also that which follow-
eth doeth shew it further: for here by no-
thing but the † *old man is Crucified* in him, &
dyeth more & more, and he groweth and
increaseth forward in being *a new creature*,
which verely is all in all. Here then is no
occasion to speake preciselie of the *perso-*
nall

† *pag. 8. 9.** *Col. 1. 24.*† *Gal. 6. 12.** *Cruz comes*
Euangelij.† *Gal. 6. 14.** *Act. 5. 41.*† *Gal. 6. 15,*
16. The world
is crucified, &c

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 33

Hell sufferings of Christ. but he speaketh of Christ's sufferings in his Members. Wherefore this is cleane mistaken.

Thus we see hitherto nothing letteth, but our *Generall Reason* is evident by the Scripture, *That Christ suffered properly & immediately in his soule: and consequentlie the Wrath of God for sinne.* Nowe it remaineth that we proceede to the rest of our *Argumentes* for this point.

The more *Speciall Reasons* proouing that Christ suffered for vs *the Wrath of God*, and euen so *the paynes of Hell or Hellish sorrowes*, are nowe here to be next considered.

More Speciall reasons, that Christ suffered the wrath of God.

But first it is good to mark these names *Hell & Hellish sorrowes*. Because all the aduantage is picked against this most christian & cōfortable doctrine by them that lone cōtention, only through the ambiguity & doubtfulnes of this word *Hell*. We meane not that Christ suffered *Hell* properlie, that is hell torments in the verie place & condition of the damned. God forbid. This grosse cogitation neuer came into our mindes, but only he suffered for our sinnes Gods *seuerer Wrath and iust Vengeance*, or rather *the very Effects* of his iust wrath & vengeance: which we affirme is equal to Hell it selfe and all the tormentes thereof in sharpnes and vehemencie of payne. And thus we say *Christ suffered Hell or Hellish sorrowes* for vs, and no otherwise. Which vve proue by many reasons.

What is meant by Christes suffering of Hell, or Hellish sorrowes.

C

First

1.

First thus: We should haue suffered such paines
are the effectes of the intollerable wrath of God for
our sinne. But Christ suffered the sorrowes & paynes
for sinne which we should. Therefore Christ suffered
for vs such sorrowes & paynes, as are the effectes of
the intollerable wrath of God for sin. The assump-
tion only can be doubted. But the prophesie
Esay affirmeth it in playn words: He bare our
iniquities, and susteyned our sorrowes. He sayeth
not only, He susteyned sorrowes, but he
susteyned our sorrowes: yea the text hath
it more significantlie. He susteyned † our very
sorrowes, or our sorrowes theselues, that is, those
which els we should haue borne. This co-
clusion can no wayes be auoyded.

† Macchabeus
Jebhalam.

* 2. Tim. 2. 8.

† Antilytron
hyper panson.

The like to this is proued * He gaue him-
selfe † a price of redemption for vs, which wee els
should haue payed. For note that antily-
tron is the price which whē a Captiue can
not him self pay, then his Prince or some
other friend payes it for him, to redeme
him withall. Now the custome and vse is,
we know, that the enemy taketh the same
price for his Captiue of an other, which
he would take els of the Captiue him self,
if he were able to pay it. Euen so the scrip-
ture here speaking after the commō vse
and custome of redeeming Captiues takē
in warre, doeth meane that Christes price
of redemptiō which he payed for vs, was the
same which els we should haue payed.

2.
* Gal. 3. 13.

Secondly I proue it thus: * Christ redeemed
vs fro the curse of the Lawe; when he was made a
Curse

Curse for vs. What *curse* was he made for vs? It is opened ver. 10. That *curse* which is comprised in *Moses: *Cursed is every man that continueth not in all things written in the Law to doe them.* And more particularly in this verie *verse* it is called *the Curse of the Law.* What is that? Surely the feeling of Gods wrath for the transgression of the Law. This *curse* therefore saith Paule *Christ was made for vs:* y is, he susteyned for vs euen the feeling of Gods wrath for our transgressions imputed to him. If any thinke, this *curse* here which Christ was made, is not the same *curse* which is here called *the curse of the law*, and is described in the wordes of *Deut: Cursed is every one,* &c. But this to be another curse, a lesser & lighter, which Christ is here affirmed to be made for vs. It is vaine and senseles to think the Apostle here speakes of two seuerall kinds of curses: the coherence sheweth that he speaketh & treateth all of one maner of *curse.* And if Christ susteyned any *curse* for vs, what *curse* could it be? Not the *curse of the law*? or what was it? Not the *curse of God*? If it were, then that is it which wee speake of, and vvhich els vve should haue borne.

If it be said, It cannot be that Christ bare our *curse*, or paid the price y we els should haue paid, or sustained *the very sorrowes* that we should haue sustained: for the he must haue suffred perpetually as the dāned do, & as we should to, had we not bin redeemed by Christ.

* Deut. 27. 26.

† Gal. 3. 13.

Obiection.

Answers

Obiection.

Answer.

*In sharpnesse
Christ suffered
as the Dam-
ned doe, but not
in continuance
of sorrow.*

Obiection.

Answer.

*It was simply
impossible that
Christ should
suffer perpetu-
ally: for a rea-
son.*

I answered. 1. The scripture it selfe affirmeth, Hee did all that for vs: Therefore who dareth denie it? Who either man or Angel shall presume to say, Nay? 2. This followeth not (if wee note well) this maketh not at all, that therefore Christ suffered *perpetually*, if he suffered our punishment and had the iust sentence of our condemnation (I meane *the full sharpnes and vehemencie of it*) translated & executed vpon him. That which he suffered might be for *time incomparably sharpe and terrible*, though induring but a while and not perpetuall. Wherefore this must be noted, we compare not the sufferings of Christ for vs with the paynes of the Damned in regarde of *continuance*: therein we neuer doubted nor any Christian, but that Christ suffered lesse, that is shorter time then we should, & the damned doe. If anie aske howe maye this be, if *Gods iustice* must stande? We answered. Yes: it may bee, because his perpetuall sufferings needed not. The infinite excellencie of his person that suffered, being the Sonne of God, countervayleth in merit and worthines the infinit continuance of punishment, which els he should, but now needed not to indure. 2 Because this abridgment & shortning of the time needes must be. I say it must needes haue bene so: because simply it was impossible to be otherwise. Which is most certen for two causes: 1. No flesh els could possiblie haue

haue bene saued, vnlesse the Sauour and redeemer had ended his payment for vs. But God had decreed to saue some, whom he gaue his sonne to suffer for. Therefore it was impossible absolutly, but our Sauours payment must end. 2. He was verie God himself that suffered: therefore it was simply impossible, but he must ouercome, and finish, and obteine his purchase. Thus then in this one point of continuance in punishment our Sauour satisfied Gods iustice, not by suffering stricktly and exactlie that which wee should, but by suffering & which in his person was fully worth & answerable to & perpetual continuance thereof, which in vs els should haue ben done. And al because of the simple necessity for which it must be so. If any ask, why were not Christs paines also lessened as well as & perpetuitie abridged, by the infinit merit of his person. I answer, Because there was no impossibilitie, no necessitie, no neede, but he might feelee the full smart of our sinnes, as there was, for him not to feelee the full continuance thereof. Seeing therefore it was possible for him to feelee all our smart, and seeing Gods strict iustice requireth it so, therefore it was so, and it must be so. He suffered for vs the full smart of our sinnes, which els wee should haue suffered both in soule and body.

I vrge then, Let it be here noted, Christ is said to be made a curse for vs: then he felt

Obiect

Answer

Christ felt the
Curse of God
upon for him
vs.

Answer.

*In sharpnesse
Christ suffered
as the Dam-
ned doe, but not
in continuance
of sorrow.*

Obiection.

Answer.

*It was simply
impossible that
Christ should
suffer perpetu-
ally: for a rea-
son.*

I answered. 1. The scripture it selfe affirmeth, Hee did all that for vs: Therefore who daresth denie it? Who either man or Angel shall presume to say, Nay? 2. This followeth not (if wee note well) this maketh not at all, that therefore Christ suffered *perpetually*, if he suffered our punishment and had the iust sentence of our condemnation (I meane *the full sharpnes and vehemencie of it*) translated & executed vpon him. That which he suffered might be for *time incomparably sharpe and terrible*, though induring but a while and not perpetuall. Wherefore this must be noted, we compare not the sufferings of Christ for vs with the paynes of the Damned in regarde of *continuance*: therein we neuer doubted not any Christian, but that Christ suffered lesse, that is shorter time then we should, & the damned doe. If anie aske howe maye this be, if *Gods iustice* must stande? We answered. Yes: it may bee, because his perpetuall sufferings needed not. The infinite excellencie of his person that suffered, being the Sonne of God, countervayleth in merit and worthines the infinit continuance of punishment, which els he should, but now needed not to indure. 2 Because this abridgment & shortning of the time needes must be. I say it must needes haue bene so: because simply it was impossible to be otherwise. Which is most certen for two causes: 1. No flesh els could possiblie haue

haue bene saued, vnlesse the Sauour and redeemer had ended his payment for vs. But God had decreed to saue some, whom he gaue his sonne to suffer for. Therefore it was impossible absolutely, but our Sauours payment must end. 2. He was verie God himself that suffered: therefore it was simply impossible, but he must ouercome, and finish, and obteine his purchase. Thus then in this one point of *continuance* in punishment our Sauour satisfied Gods *ius- tice*, not by suffering stricktly and exactlie that which wee should, but by suffering y^e which in his person was fully worth & an- swerable to y^e perpetual cōtinuance ther- of, which in vs els should haue ben done. And al because of the simple necessity for which it must be so. If any ask, why were not Christs paines also lessened as well as y^e perpetuitie abridged, by the infinit me- rit of his person. I answer, Because there was no impossibilitie, no necessitie, no neede, but he might feelee *the full smart* of our sinnes, as there was, for him not to feelee *the full continuance* thereof. Seeing therefore it was possible for him to feelee all our *smart*, and seeing Gods strict *iustice* requireth it so, therefore it was so, and it must be so. He suffered for vs *the full smart* of our sinnes, which els wee should haue suffered both in soule and body.

I vrge then, Let it be here noted, Christ is said to be *made a curse for vs*: then he felt

Christ felt the
Curse of God
vpon for him
vs.

this *curse*. And before I shewed this *curse* was Gods *curse*: and what is that, but Gods *wrath* for sinne. So then Christ is heere proued to haue felt Gods *wrath* for sinne.

Obiection.

If you replie: This *curse* is not Gods *curse*, nor his *wrath* for sinne: but only a shame and ignominy amongst men for his bodilie hanging on the tree: it vvas an ignominious death, and that was all which is here meant, because *every one* els is not cursed by God, that is opely executed: as here the Apostle expressly hath it. I answer, 1.

Answer.

It is more then absurd to saye, The *curse* heere which Christ bare for vs, was only & meerey but the opinion of the people, holding it a sham to be executed to death openly: Will any man of common reason say, that this is all the *curse* that Christ bare for vs, or that here is meant? Nothing but y^e thame of the world? and no other thing betwene God & him? To name this opinion is cōfutatiō enough. Further where your reason is, Because *every one* is saide to be cursed which *hangeth on the tree*.

Obiection.

Answer.

Knowe you that the meaning is, *Every one* that so *hangeth* by the iust sentence of the Lawe: wherefore it is heere called the *curse of the lawe*. Nowe then not euery one that is hanged is cursed: for many innocentes & martyrs *are hanged*, who are most blessed. But euerie, one that is iustly hanged, is cursed. And so vvas Christ heere. You will

Will aske: What vvas Christ *justly* hanged on the tree? Yea verily, by the *just* sentence of the Law vvas he put to death: neither let this be strange to any Christian. Is not the *Suretie* by the iust sentence of the Law condemned to pay his debt, for whom he hath vvolingly & aduisedly vnderaken? Is it wronge, is it violence for the Lawe to lay the penaltie on the *Suretie*, when the debtor can not discharge it? But if it bee meere and true Justice, and no wronge, then was Christ by the *just* sentence of the Law hanged on the tree, & so he bare in deed the true *Curse* of the Lawe. Not in respect that he was an innocent man, nor as the Iewes Magistrates had to doe with him, for so they did him most foule wronge that Crucified him: but as he took on him our person, as he was made *sure* for vs, and as he stood forth in our name to aunsvvere Gods iustice, So was the *just* sentence of our condemnation according to the iustice of the Lawe inflicted on him, albeit the Levies saue it not.

Howe Christ was in our person *justly* cursed of God and executed for vs.

Some will saye, This *Curse* heere vvas only bodily: For so it is proued by those vvordes of the Lawe, that speake only of a bodily executio. So it may aswell be concluded, That the *Psal. proueth not Christes taking of a perfect body, but only of a Mans eares, because there is mention of no more; Eares thou hast prepared me.

Obiection.

† He that hangeth on a tree,

Answer.

* Psal. 40. 6.

C. 4. Yet

Heb. 10. 5.

Yet the ^{*}holy Ghost sheweth thereby that he had a perfect *body*, *A body thou hast sayd ned me*: yea in deed both *a body* and *a soule*. Therefore both here and there & in many other such like places the Scripture noteth *a part for the whole*: and so heere in our text *a parte* of the iust curse of the Law, thereby meaning the *whole*: that is, *hanging on the tree* for *the whole executio* of the Lawes sentence against sin. For this bodily *Hanging* was a part of the Lawes Curse: & the *Soules* suffering is also by the Curse of the Lawe as well as this of the body, and conteyneth the feeling of Gods wrath too, as well as the simple Dying, the dissolution of the soule from the body: and is it selfe

† the wages of sinne no lesse, yea more in deed, then the bodily death, though the bodily death be also. The which meaning is here easie & necessarie to be gathered, seeing such a terme is given to this *hanging on the tree* which compriseth the whole effect of al that I say, which also the holy Ghost sayeth, He was *Curst* by it, yea *made a curse*. What doeth this els but signifie the wrath of God, the curse of God felt by him that was so hāged, as is aboue shewed: yea felt in his soule, seeinge this alwayes lighteth more properly on the Soule then on the Body. Therefore this *hanging* is here set as *a part for the whole* execution of Gods iust Curse, & argueth the whole to be on him that was executed, that is on Christ.

† Rom. 5. 12.

& 6. 23.

Gen. 3. 3.

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

41

Obiect

If it bee objected, It is not possible that Christ the most holy and obedient sonne, the most perfectly beloued of God, yea personally one with God him selfe, that in his Soule could feele Gods wrath. It is not possible, but God must hate him on whom his wrath lighted, and in him must be found a conscience of sinne, but *Christ knew no sinne, neither in his mouth was found any guile.* And speciallie he, who God is wroth withall, can not be one person with God him selfe. Seeing then a twofolde separation followeth, 1. of the Deitie from the Humanitie, 2. of Gods loue and protection from Christ, and nothing remayneth but harred, horroure of conscience, and vicer darknes vpon him, if he felt Gods wrath & hellish tormentes: Therefore it is *absurd, impious, hereticall and blasphemous* so to holde and maintaine.

Obiect, if
he could
be
in
hell
and
yet
not
feel
the
wrath
of
God

God defend: *This curse causes shall not come.* But rather the contrarie laying wil proue such: For *they digge a pit for others and fall into it them selues.* But I answer, howe could * Death possesse the body of Christe three dayes yea howe could his body here be accursed and *made a Curse*, which is a thing confessed? And yet I hope all this whyle his body was not separated from his Godhead personally: euen so neither was his soule, neither need it to be disioyned from the Godhead, when it was accursed for vs, and susteyned Gods wrath. And as the very body

Answer

* The wages of
sine.

A TREATISE OF THE

body of Christ was then not hated of God neither out of his protection for all that extreame humiliation: Euen so neither was his *soule*. Therefore God alwayes loued Christ, he alwayes imbraced him, hee alwayes was knit to him in regard of his own innocent person: and yet wee may say in another regard, that is of *our person* which he susteyned being all sinfull and rebellious, God cursed him, God hated him, God punished him iustly, or rather our sinne vpon him, til by his sacrifice accomplished, he tooke it all away. So then we must well note, in Christ were *two persons* or conditions. 1. his own, wherein he was most holy, most innocent, most beloued, most blessed. 2. Hee tooke *our person* on him, and presented himselfe therein before his Father, and so he became by our sinnes, sinfull, defiled, hatefull, and accursed. *The Surety* though he bee vtterly cleere and obnoxious to none, yet by his *suretyship* hee is a debtor and obnoxious to the Creditour & the Law. If a *tender ladyes* only child should by some casualtie be allrombled in blood, or mire, & most stinking filth: The child so berayed and lothsome would breed greate abhorring and lothing in the delicate eyes of the dainty lady: yet the childs own *person* should be neuer the lesse beloued of the mother, but rather the more if it may bee. So

In Christ were
2. estates or
conditions, or
he susteyned 2
persons: ours,
and his owne.

such

such *two persons* or conditions are found in Christ: according to one hee was alwayes beloued, according to the other which he spoke vpon him (whilst hee had not finished that office) hee was *justly* accursed. And if we see not how this may be in his *soule*, consider howe it was in his body, (which neither is nor can be denyed) and then it will appeare howe his *soule* also might susteyne for vs the *curse* of God, and yet no *separation* to follow.

But some will say: this *curse* here is no Obiect. thing els but simply to dye, the dissolution of the body and soule: which the *Scripture* saith is a *curse* in deede: [*in the day that thou shalt eate of the forbidden fruite, thou shalt dye the death.*] Nowe this death befall-eth to the deereft children of God still: that is, to dye. Therefore they also beare this curse though they bee cleere from the vengeance and wrath of God. Even so and no otherwise is Christ heere saide to be accursed, only because he dyed.

* Gen. 3. 3.

Answer.

Note.

† See also pag. 24.

Heere wee deny that the death of the righteous is properly a *curse* or a punishment for sinne. For so the Godly are forgiven the *faults* but not the *punishment* of sinne. Which is one of the Popish heresies. Therefore death in the Godly is not properly a punishment of sin, nor properly a curse of the Lawe. Indeed in it selfe and of it owne nature it is so, as it was first inflicted by the reuenger of sinne

sinne for sinne: but in the godly & faithfull childe of God it is not so: the nature and propertie of it is cleane changed plainly a good thing and to be desired, as *Raule* sayeth, *Death is to me a gainet, I desire to be dissolved & to be with Christ*. Which he ought not to saye if death were properly a curse to him. And *Christ* sayeth such men *shall not dye, but passe from death to life*. Where he denyeth flatly the name of *Death* vnto it, euen because the nature of it is changed to the godly. Neither can it be strange that the selfe same thing may be cleane changed & of a diuers nature in diuers persons. To kil a mans self, in *Achutophel*, was a foule and monstrous sinne: but in *Sampson* it was a most glorious vertue, when he pulled the house vpon his owne and the *Philistines* heades. Here the selfe same act to kill ones selfe is of a diuers nature in diuers men, good in *Sampson*, but most wicked in *Achutophel*. And euen as some *Physike* in a sound mans stomach is poyson, which in a sicke man is medicinable: and riches to the wicked are vniust possessions increasing their iudgement, but to the godly they are true blessings. So the selfe same thing in diuers persons may be cleane of diuers and contrary natures. And euen so death is to the wicked a curse for sin: yet to the godly it is not death, but a passage to life: no Curse properly, nor punishment of sinne, but a benefit and advantage. Therefore
Christes

34 SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

Christes dying simply as the godly dye, may in no sorte heere be called a curse, or cursed. But seeing the text sayeth, *Hee was made a Curse for vs*, or accursed in his death: Therefore he dyed not simply as the godly dye, *He indured the Curse and wrath of God truly.*

I proceed nowe to another profe Col. 2.

3. Christ on the crosse spoiled principalities and powers, and made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them. These principalties are the

Demells and powers of darknes: the instruments of Gods iustice & wrath, the tempters which assault & wraastle with al good men. Euen so heere they assault and con-

flikt with Christ whom they did chiefly desire to overthrow, being the head of

all the rest: but here is shewed his glorious victory and conquest vpon them. There-

fore it is certaine they on the Crosse moste furiously attempted him, & he felt them,

that is to say, the very instrumentes that wrought the very effectes of Gods seueri-

tie and wrath vpon him: but he at the last most gloriously conquered them & trode

them vnder his feete in that place. If any doubt that these wordes are not to be re-

ferred to the crosse of Christ, it shalbe made most manifest that they are, and vndeny-

able (God willing) in the next question.

Further this reason will prooue the same, taken from the lesse to the more: The members of Christ doe wraastle with the

powers

3.

Eph. 6. 12. 16

† Heere some say, that Christ payed the price and did satisfaccion to the Diuill properly, and not to God. But it can not want both absurdity and impiety so to say. Hee payed it to Gods iustice, to his holy severity, whereof the Diuill was but executioner.

4.

The Godly sinner taste of Hellish sorrow in this life.

*Eph. 6. 12, 16

powers of darkness, and endure the fyrie darts of the
Diuell. And Iob cryeth out * The arrows of
the Almighty are in me, the venome whereof do
drinke & my spirit, and the terrors of God fight
against me. The like terrors doeth Iona
seme to feele in the fishes belly. When
hee cryed to the Lorde out of the bottome of hel.
And David wanted not the like in his
manifolde and fearefull agonies many
times. Thus doe the members of Christ
suffen. Therefore of necessitie Christ our
Heade suffered the like: yea much ra-
ther, and saue greater terrors of GOD,
and assautes of the Diuell. For therein
haue we * *conformitie with him, euen in all*
kindes of sufferinges. Therefore in suffer-
inges Christ Iesus hath matched vs at
least, yea surely hath gonne beyonde vs.
This is the † *Cuppe and the Baptisme which*
Christ affirmed should be common with
his Disciples and him selfe, though hee
dranke this Cup deeper then any els. And
it is saide, * *He was like vs in all pointes, then*
he was like vs in sufferinges, and specially
in the mainest sufferinges, which are the
terrors and the wrath of God, which as
is proued, the godly are not exempted
from in this life, and yet neuer are, nor
can be touched deeper, then was Christ.
Yea further, in these places to the He-
brewes hee sheweth a reason which can
neuer be refuted by the witt of man. Hee
saith, * *Forasmuch as we were made to suffer,*

* Iob. 6. 4.

† Ion. 2. 2.

* Rom. 8. 29.

† Math. 20. 23.

* Heb. 4. 15.

and a. 17.



SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 247

succoured vs not, but wherein he hath had experience of our temptations and infirmities. But he succoureth vs even in these our temptations affecting the terrors of God and the sorrows of Hell. Therefore he him selfe had experience of the same. This heere the very Scripture sayeth: Wherefore in all thinges is behoued him, that he might be made like vnto his Brethren, that he might bee mercifull and a faithfull high priest in changes concerning God. Doe, he was made like vs, that he might be mercifull and faithfull towards vs.

† Heb. 2. 17.
18.

Againe bothen ophile. Wherefore he taught, it behoued him so to be. Therefore hee could not haue bene mercifull and faithfull to vs, unlesse hee had bene like vs. Which also more fully appeareth in the wordes most significant followinge, *En hi gar pepouthen autos petrastheis, dynatas tois petrazomenois boerhesai*. For in that which him selfe suffered and was tempted in, hee is able to succour them that are tempted: or that are (so) tempted. Here he giueth the reason why hee succoureth vs being tempted, because him selfe also hath likewise suffered. Also he sayeth, thereby Christ is able to succour vs: as if els hee had not bene able to bee rightlie mercifull. And heere we thinke *en hi* hath a singular force more then is commonlie obserued: Even to note the particular matter wherein Christ is able to succour, namely in that which him selfe hath suffered before.

So

So that if Christ haue not suffered it, or the like, then he is not able to succour vs in such sufferings and temptations. For surely otherwise he can not say heere as he doth, that Christ was made like his brethren in temptations and sufferings. And all this he sheweth further *Cha. 4. 14, 15, 16.* *Let vs hold fast our profession, for wee haue not a high priest that can not bee touched with our infirmities; but was in all things tempted in like sort, yet without sinne.* He closely meeteth heere with an objection. Some might think Christ being so high & heavenly could not haue sufficient compassion towardes our miseries. Nay sayth he, *We haue not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but hee was in all things tempted in like sort.* Therefore let vs hold faste our profession: and therefore let vs goe boldly to the throne of grace, that we may receiue mercy and finde grace in due time, or in time of need. Which is as much as to say, If he were not like vs in all temptations and sufferings, hee could not minister helpe to vs in time of need: but now he is one that hath felt all our feelings, or the like in ouery point. Therefore he can help vs in all need, and wee are not to doubt. And thus by all these Scriptures it is proved that Christ suffered the wrath of God and the sorrowes of Hell, which the godlie in this life sometimes doe taste also. Adde herevnto, that of all Absurdities, this is the greatest, & meeere Men should suffer more deeply

Absurdity.

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 49

deepely & more bitterly then Christ did. And yet they doe so, if Christ suffered not at all any sense of Gods wrath nor y^e sorrowes of hell: which many meere men haue & doe suffer many times, as is aboue declared, and shall further appeare hereafter.

Nowe an other reason, from *Heb. 5. 7.* where thus it is written of Christ: *In the dayes of his flesh he offered vp prayers and supplications with stronge crying and teares vnto him that was able to saue him from death, and was heard in that which he feared, or, being deliuered, from his feare.* Here first it may be asked, What prayers and supplications with stronge crying and teares for feare of death, were these which he poured forth to God in the dayes of his flesh? And where may vve learne them? Wee may learne what these were in the storie of Christes life and death expressed in the Euangelistes in three places. First, *Ioh. 12. 27.* where he listeth vp his voyce, sayinge: *Nowe is my soule troubled: And what shall I saye? Father, saue me frō this hower. But therefore came I into this hower.* The seconde place: where after he had mourned in the garden, saying, *My soule is * euery way compassed* *Math. 26. 38.* with sorrowes to death. He goeth a little further & falling on his face, he prayeth saying: *O my Father if it be possible let this cuppe passe from me. Neuerthelesse not as I will, but as thou wilt.* which hee prayeth three seuerall times, with such feare & terror of minde *ver. 44*

D that

* Luke 22. 44

† ver. 43.

* ekthambis-
that hai ade-
monein.

Mar. 14. 33,

34.

† Mat. 27. 46.

Pag. 4. 5. 6.

that his body, as yet without all harme
 trickled downe with clots of blood in steede
 sweate: and *†* an Angell appeared to him com-
 forting him. His sorrowe also and trouble
 of minde most terrible beeing expressed
 where he is said to ** be affrighted*, as it were
 and miserably distressed because of this bitter
 cuppe. The third place, where now han-
 ging on the crosse before he dyed the cryed
 with a loude voyce, *My God, my God, why hast thou*
forsaken me. To these places doubtles this
 text in *Heb. 5. 7.* hath relation, saying, *That*
in the dayes of his flesh hee did offer vp prayers and
supplications, with stronge crying and teares vnto
him that was able to saue him from death, & was
heard in that which hee feared. Nowe these
 things being thus considered, I make this
 argument: *In all these places it is most certaine*
Christ suffered in his soule the wrath of God due to
our sinnes. Therefore he suffered the wrath of God,
and not his bodily stripes only. The An-
 tecedent I prone by 3. reasons, gathered
 from these Scriptures. First because hee
 nowe suffered in his soule properly and immedi-
 atlie: *My soule is every way compassed with sor-*
rowes. Therefore this was the wrath of GOD
 for our sinnes which he now suffered: as
 I haue plainlie shewed in the *†* beginning
 of this treatise. 2. Because he so feared &
 shunned this conflict, which yet he knew
 he deserued not, and was also accordinge
 to the will of God for him to suffer. It is
 not possible but hee suffred more then
 the

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 51

the bodily death only, it must needs be the
 inspeakeable & intollerable wrath of God
 that he so feareth it & desireth to shunne
 it. His Disciples he had * taught careful-
 ly of that point before, sayinge: Feare not
 them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the
 soule: but feare him that can kill both soule &
 body in Hell Which generally also he com-
 maundeth all the Godly euermore. How
 can this be that him self should doe con-
 trarie to that, that he commaundeth others?
 Such folly in the Son of God, far be it frō
 vs once to imagine, as that he should stag-
 ger, & shrink, & fayle in that w^h he so ear-
 nestlie warned others of, and so straight-
 ly commaunded: viz. not to feare the bo-
 dily, gilty, vnderferued death, & allotted
 of God: but therfore rather to be glad &
 reioyce. And accordingly haue infinite ma-
 ny Martyrs, as their expresse stories doe
 witnesse: * yea wicked and vngodly men,
 endured with boldnes and great ioy farre
 more exquisite and barbarous tormentes
 & sharper tortures, as touching the body,
 then Christ could endure? or then can
 with reason be affirmed and attributed to
 that which Christ endured, if we view his
 passion? Haue infinit many meere men
 don this? And shal this Iyō of the tribe of Iuda,
 & Labe of God, that is the prince of patience
 and of all fortitude be so beany, so fearfull,
 so miserably afflicted & dismayed afore hand
 as the storie declareth, only for feare of his bo-

* Math. 10. 28

† 1 Pet. 3. 14,
 15. & 4. 13,
 16.

* The Thierues
 Crucified with
 Christ suffered
 as great bodilie
 violence as hee
 did, Luk 23. 40
 They were all
 together in one
 and the same
 condemnation
 Except they
 suffered more
 then he did, be-
 cause they con-
 tinued longer.
 Ioh. 19. 32, 33.

duly death? Which also he foreknewe and could not be ignorant of, that he vvas ordained of God to suffer it, and that by the hands of most malicious and furious enemies? Cā it be thought that Christ would through feare pray against this meere *duly death*, and his soule be so troubled, & frightened, distracted therewith, that the verie anguish and torment of mind should vvring out of his body *sweat of clotted blood* which neuer vvas heard of in any other man beside, & that he should *desire* so earnestly and so often to auoid it cleane, and being in it, to cry out with much weeping *that he was forsaken of God?* It can not be, I say it can not be, but Christ should *some* in so praying against the knowne will of God, & against his owne most willing purpose except vve saye it vvas a greater horroure of punishment that lighted on his verie *soule*, which partlie by the feeling & partlie by the feare thereof did expresse such tokens, and did so stonish and amaze and ouervhelme his humane weakenes (as in very nature such cases doe & will bring to passe), especiallie novve the *Diuine* assistance of purpose withdrawing it selfe. For a man in such amazednes, doeth easily on a suddaine become *forgetfull* of himselfe. And being forgetfull and *astonished* (which an infinit payne present, and feare of more cominge, will quicklie driue vs into)

into) no maruell if Christ, as a very man, let fall in this case words now and then, which in his good remembraunce hee beleeve well enough were as contrarie to Gods will, as they were sureable with *manes mist mist* in him. Now then, it was surely the *horror of Gods wrath* that oppressed him, (seeing it is vaine and senselesse to think his meere bodily torments, yea the *share of them* did it, or that meere bodilie he suffered † more sharpe and vehement things then anie man euer did. All the deuices and amplifications of some men are but shifres and trifles to prooue that. And here a fine fable is offered vs withal: *Note* that vve should beleeue Christes *bodily* paynes though so violēt, yet *hastened* they no whit his death at all, neither vvas hee the neerer it at the last, then at the firste for all his payne. Which is a *paradox* in nature, and contrarie to Scripture, whiche saith, *He was like vs in all thinges, sinne only excepted*. But some will saye, He desired this thing *three tymes* in the Garden, and once before. If this were to the ende that he might escape the feeling of Gods wrath assigned vnto him as the speciall parte of his passion, howe could he be so forgetful so oft of that which he knew full wel, and regarded diligentlie. How could he? Nay how could he not, but be *affrighted, astonished, forgetfull, & all confounded* in his wholl humanity, both in all powers of his soule,

† See the same
starie pag. 320

Obiection.

† Ioh. 12. 970

Answer

and senses of his bodye, not *three* tymes only, but *three skore tymes three tymes*, yea continuallye and without interchāgeable respiration, if Gods wrath for sinne had bin still, and continually reuealed vpon him. For as it pleased God to open to his manhood the touche and sense of his wrath sometymes more, sometymes lesse, and sometymes staying it, So hee was agayne and agayne sometymes more, sometymes lesse confounded therewith, and sometymes a while refreshed. And if this had returned 300. *tymes* vpon him, verelie hee could not but haue sunke vnder the same 300. *tymes* also. Alas, we litle thinke what the bitternes of *Gods wrath* is, and what the waight of his indignation is to the feeling of mans soule & body. The want of due knowledge and consideration whereof, I feare, is one chiefe cause of broching this moste shamefull quæstion. Rather vvee may beeholde and see heere as in a glasse, the vsupportable heauines and intollerable smart of Gods anger for our siones, which Christ put vpon him selfe for our deliverance: And agayne, that Christ became in deed *a man* for vs, when as agayne and agayne hee could not but shrinke and be confounded vnder that burden. If the waight of *Pauls Church* were layed on the backe of anie Gyant in the worlde many and sundry tymes, were it anie maruell if euery time it crushed him

SYFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 55

him still to pieces? Much lesse is it, if the burthen of Gods wrath, farre heauier the whole earth oftentimes rouchinge a man, he be confounded with it continually. Thus then it can not be straunge if oftentimes Christ fell amazed, confounded, and forgetfull of him selfe for feare and grieve, when the agonie was on him, it being euen the sense of Gods wrath, & of the curse of the Lawe for vs.

If anie say, Christ as *man* being a finite creature could not feele infinite wrath.

Obiection.

I answered, The *wrath of God* due to sinne, as it commeth from God, is *infinite*, as his iustice, and as hee him selfe is *infinite*. And though Christ as a Creature, could not comprehend the infinitnesse of it, yet he could, being not capable of it, nor able to susteyne it, bee ouerwhelmed and confounded, and astonished with it.

Answer.

If you saye, this were to make Christ to sinne if he were so disturbed and so distracted, and so confounded with feare & horroure: Where was his faith, where vvas his patience, vvhether vvas his obedience to God, where was his love to his church, if now he desired not to drinke this Cup for them? I aunswere: All this might bee in Christ, and in deede so it was, without anie touch of sinne or defect of grace at all. Nay, vnlesse this had bene in him, he had sinned in deede, which blasphemy God forbid.

Obiection.

Answer.

*Christ though
amazed and
confounded with
sorrows and
fores, yet re-
mained still
sinlesse.*

Touthing the firste, Notwithstanding all this amazednes and feare in Christ, he sinned not. I graunt we could not but haue sinned in the like, but he did not. Because, euen as if you set two glasses filled, the one with muddy water, and the other with cleere Christall water, and firste lett them stande till all the muddines in the one be settled at the bottome, then shake both these glasses, in the one the mudde ariseth straightway, and defileth all the water there: in the other, although you shake it neuer so much, yet the cleere water, though troubled likewise, remayneth still all cleere as cristall. Euen so if anie of vs bee shaken and disquieted with anie trouble, our Muddy affections arisinge doe presentlie defile vs allouer: but Christ (in whom was Mans true Nature, but not anie the least defilement of Nature) being likewise shaken, hee remayned still cleere from anie the least spot of sinne at all. For to shunne griefe is natural in what we may: and being amazed & forgetfull, Then to shunne that which els we should and would suffer, is no sinne neither, but Natures instinct. And on occasion to bee forgetfull, (euen as some * ignorance, is not sinne) it is Natures infirmitie, but no sinne. If a man in distresse fall a sleepe, and then lift not vp his heart to God, he sinneth not,

* Marc. 13. 33

not

not

not

nor he that being amazed with some violent blowe on the head, calleth not vpon God: because nature is oppressed, and cannot doe that whiche hee would and should doe. Also in this man so astonished, or in him a sleepe, we can not saye, there is any lesse grace: There is no decay of faith, nor of obedience, nor of patience, nor of loue. Euen so in Christ nowe in this case, there was no defect of grace, but an infirmitie of nature, which euen by creatio can not indure the displeasure of God, but by it owne confusion withall.

Nowe touching the next point, That vnlesse Christ were so, that is, so *astounded*, and *forgesfull* by reason of the intolerable sorrowe and horror which confounded his humane Nature, he had sinned by these requestes: whiche blasphemie God forbid. That is most true: and first I proue it: and then will answere the exceptions against it. It is proued manifestlie, because if Christ had prayed aduisedlie, and with good memorie against the knowne will of God, hee had sinned. As to pray against the tasting of his bitter passion, was against Gods will known vnto him. Howe appeareth that, euen his knowing thereof? First him selfe expressly saith it: *Therefore I came into this hower.* Secondlie, hee could not els haue corrected and reproofed (as he did) his owne wordes presentlie goinge before.

† Ioh. 12. 27.

What

What shall I say? Father save me from this bower
*but therefore I came into this bower. And, *O*
Father if it be possible let this Cup passe from me
neverthelesse not as I will, but as thou wilt. And
† O my Father if this Cup cannot passe away from
me, but that I must drinke it: thy will be done
*Marke hath it thus: * Father, all things are*
possible unto thee: take away this Cup from me
Neverthelesse not as I will, but as thou wilt.
 Therefore Christ prayed and desired, and
 plainly corrected his will by Gods will.
 And in correcting it, it was contrary, yet
 and he knew it so to be. This place hath
 bin chiefly vsed of the *Ancients*, & it is very
 singuler, against the heresie of the *Monothelists*,
 who held that Christe had in him
 but one will. This now hurterh not these
 heretiks, if it serue not vs also in this ques-
 tion. This place therefore sheweth he
 had a *naturall humane* will at this time con-
 trary to his *diuine* will, desiring to shunne
 paine which he knew hee was to suffer
 while through *astonishment* hee thought
 not himselfe. Through *astonishment* I say
 for els this contrarines of his *humane* will
 to his *diuine*, could not haue wanted sinne
 because remembreing himselfe suddainly
 he knew and acknowledged Gods will to
 be that he should suffer, which immedi-
 atly before he had spoken against. Third-
 lie this proueth that he knew it was Gods
 determinate will, in that hee termeth it
a bower, that is a time set of God for this
 his

* Math. 26. 39

† ver. 42.

* Ch. 14. 36.

Monothelists.

Ioh. 12. 37.

Mar. 14. 43

suffering, which he desired to escape. Fourthly, because hee so mightely feared it, therefore doubtlesse he knew that he was appointed to suffer it. Thus it is manifest in plaine words he prayed contrary to Gods knowne will: which vnlesse it were in *astomishment*, and nature beeing oppressed with the horror of his paine and feare, hee could not haue wanted sinne, which God forbid.

As for the *exceptions* against this 1. They say all these *prayers* and *requestes* of his may be that his bodily death might not haue dominion ouer him. And so hee might pray and not against the knowne will of God. This is absurd to say that he prayed

Obiection.

in such feare and horror and terror of minde against that which hee perfectly knew should neuer come to him: namely, that the dominion of death should hold him. Therefore this could not trouble him. Secondly some say, this in *† Iohn*,

Answer.

* Mar. 10. 34.

concernes not his passion, but his appearance in Gods preface onely to receiue sentence against Satan the Prince of this world: as it semeth ver. 31. I answer, Who neuer doubted but Christe receiued sentence against Satan by his passion accomplished, the houre wherof now neere approached, & wherof now presently he had, it semeth, a strong forerast: hee heere cleared his people from the power of the Deuill, & Satan himselfe he vtterly overthrew;

Obiection.

† Ioh. 12. 27.

Answer.

threw; which was done so absolutely at his death that not only him selfe cryed out *it is finished*, but also the Apostle sayeth, *even then he triumphed over Satan*: which in the next question we shall shewe further. It is true then, Christ *now received sentence* against Satan: but therefore had he now no feeling of his passion? Would hee cry out, that *his soule was so troubled*, that he wist not what to say? And yet said then, *Father save me from this hower*? Would hee bee thus grieved, afflicted, and distracted *to receive sentence against his enemy*? What sence is there in this? Doe men vie to be terrified, or to reioyce and triumph when before an iudge they haue sentence giuen with the against their enemy. If you say, only the presence of Gods Maiestie terrified and astonished Christes humane infirmities though he receiued a benefit. If it were so with him in receiuing an honor and dignity from God, would it not bee so with him much rather in bearing his curse for our sinnes? interpret this *curse* how you will. When hee bare it as from GOD, would not Gods presence then much more terrifie and affright him? But the truth is, the presence of Gods Maiestie neuer did so grieue, amaze, and astonish Christes manhood in such cases who not onely was his dearest Sonne but also personally knit and ioyned with God himself, whereby it could not be that the

Maic-

Maiestie so amazed him, which was so vnto him, and alwayes susteyned him. As also examples most frequent in the Gospel doe declare. How often did Christ pray vnto his Father: he alwayes then presented himself before Gods Maiesty. And doe we read that euer he was vexed, terrified, and amazed in so doing? namely in Ioh: 17. appeareth there any such passion in all that louge, most earnest, and effectual prayer? Nothingh lesse verely, nor any where els, where he appeareth before Godsmaiesty for this end to receaue Loue and Honor from GOD. Onely in case of his passion, when hee appeared to receiue iustice and seueritie at his hand, then in deed his Maiesty and the sense of his seueri iustice proceeding from him might well astonish & confound any creature, specially a guilty creature, as Christ man was, namely in the person and countenance wherein now he appeared. Therefore hee spake these wordes, * in respect of his passion now drawing neere: which also the ver. 33. plainly declareth: *Nowe this he sayed, signifying what death he should dye.* For it hangeth with the ver. 32. next before, *And if I were lift vp fro the earth would draw all men vnto me.* And this most plainly hath reference to this verse 27. whereof it is in parte an opening or exposition. Thirdly, Some except further against this † threefolde prayer, *If it be possible lett this Cuppe passe from me: that this*

* Ioh. 12. 32.

Objection.

† Math. 26. 39
44.

• Heb. 5. 7.

Answer.
*Christ both
 feared and felt
 Gods wrath for
 Jans.*

this was for feare indeed of feeling the wrath of God, but hee felt it not. For as the * Apostle sheweth, He prayed vehemently against it, and *was heard* and so *delivered from it*. I answered, indeed this were a point of high wisdom and singular wit to shew that Christ in this sort as the Scripture telleth *feared* Gods wrath, & yet *felt it* never a whit. Firſt it is well you graunt that Christ came so neere it that he *feared* it, yea hee *so feared* it that with strong cries and reares he prayed against it, yea and with the agony thereof he *sweat blood* which must proceed of such grief of the minde, (ſeing the body was not touched) as was never heard of in any man: & was thus *affrighted* and *distressed* therewith out of measure. If he were thus neere it, then I hope it is neither *impious*, *heretically*, nor *blasphemous*, for a man to say hee *felt* it. For in good sooth, if to *fear* it bee not to *feele* it any whit at all, specially *such a feare* as this is described in the Scripture to be, I know not what *feeling* is. Besides Luke sayeth, † *He was now in the agony*: then he *felt*, yea most bitterly, that which he so stroued withall. What is that but the *Cuppe* there mentioned, even of Gods wrath, that hee prayed might *paſſe from him*. Againe howe could he so deeply *feare* it, but knowing it was ordayned for him? Shewe me this how he could possibly so *feare* it but that he knew Gods will was that hee should drinke

Ch. 22. 44.

drinke of it. And indeed that it was so, I
 haue proued before already. If then hee
 was *ordained* to it, most certainly he tasted
 it, he felt it, he indured it. Some will say
 how could he *fear* it if he *felt* it? For *fear*
 is an expectation of euill to come: and it
 is written, *He was heard in that which he feared*
and was deliuered from it. I answer, indeede
 he both *felt* and *feared* it. Hee felt it intol-
 erably: but yet feared it more: in the
 distressfull agony and the very confusion
 of the powers of his nature he considered
 not how long it might hold him, and how
 infinitely more it might yet increase vpon
 him, seeing he was not come to the grea-
 test of his passion. This he might *fear*, and
 yet presently *feele* sorrow vnspeakable to.
 Herevpon after the instinct of nature ab-
 horring fro paine, he desired to be relea-
 sed, yet suddenly reproueth his nature
 herein: *Not as I will Father, but thy will be done.*
 Howbeit his Father heard him and deli-
 uered him *out of that which hee feared.* Not
 from feeling it, but from being forsaken
 in it. For the very word semeth to say, He
 was in it: *in salem theis*, Hee was heard being in it.
 You will reply, Christ feared not to bee
 forsaken in Gods wrath: he could not *fear*
 that. Therefore it was not *that* which in this
 place God deliuered him *from*. I answer
 two things: Though Christ feared not to
 be forsaken finally in the feeling of Gods
 wrath, though he could not *fear* that,
 nei-

Obiection.

Answer.

*Apo. 1. 11. who
 belee...*

Obiection.

Answer.

neither directly prayed against γ point
yet Gods wrath may be it which here he
felt & feared, and was deliuered from. For
he may be truly saide to bee heard in his
prayer vwhen the Lorde letteth him taste
of the Cup for all that, & susteynerh him
in tasting it, and in due season deliuereth
him out of it. As *Paule* vvas heard in that
 γ 2 Cor. 12. 8. he prayed for, vwhen γ he besought the Lorde
Christ to take away from him the messenger of Sa-
than buffitting him. He vvas hearde, I saye
herein, not that this prick in the flesh was ta-
ken away cleane from him. γ But in that he
receyued grace sufficient to beare it, and in
due season to be eased of it. But further I
affirme Christs nature in γ most dreadfull
agonie and distemper of al the powers of
his soule and body might feare a kinde of
forsaking, that is, least his humane nature
should for a time be left alone and naked
from al comfortable feeling of assistance
of the Godhead. This kinde of forsaking he
might and did feare, yea he felt it after-
ward to most certainly, vwhen he cryed,
My God my God, why hast thou forsaken me. I say
a kinde of forsaking this is: for there is an-
other kinde of forsaking, which in deede it
were blasphemie to say that Christ either
felt or feared it. Namely, to be cast away
and forsaken vutterly vwith hatred of his
Father. This were in deed desperation in
Christ, if he had but feared it, which God
forbid we should once dreame of. His ex-
presse

γ 2 Cor. 12. 8.

γ v. 9.

None Christ
was forsaken in
his passion.

γ Math. 24. 46

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 65

These wordes euen then confute that, in calling him *Father*, and in crying earnestly to him *my God, my God*. This he could not doe but that he was farre from desperation, or feare of a finall *forsaking*. Yet this letteth nothing at all but he might feare the other *forsaking*, that is touching the payne and sorrow to be left al comfortles and alone some while, the Godhead as it were withdrawing and hyding it selfe from him for the season of his passion, he being in the sense & feeling thereof: which thing he perceyued his meere manhood was not possibly able to endure. And therefore a little before he felt the extremitie of it, he prayed that it might *pass* from him, yet presentlie submitted him selfe to it: and after in this very extremitie, when he did not *feare* it, but *felt* it, hee cryed vnder the burthen pitiously, & complayned to his *Father* of it, *why hast thou forsake me*. Thus he might *feare* it, and *feele* it, and crying to be comforted he might be *heard* in it, & deliuered out from it, according to the *scrip-
 ture. I knowe our Contraries doe fancy other senses of this † text, *My God my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Sometime they speake as if Christ did then but singe the Psalme 22. whiche beginneth with those wordes, *My God my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Did he *singe*? Wherefore? To shewe his patience, his ioye, and triumphe there on the crosse, ouer all the malice of his eni-
 mics?

* Heb. 5. 7.

Obiect.
 † Math. 27. 46

Answer

E

mies? Naye these wordes are contrarie
to such ioye, and triumph: *why hast thou
forsaken me.* It is a token of great deiection
of minde & of rare miserie to complayne
to be *forsaken of God*: Therefore he *sung* not
then to triumph over his enemies. Where-
fore then? Did he *sunge* a mournefull and
dolorous lamentation to be so abandoned
and left to the despite and rage of the
Iewes all helpelesse? God forbid we should
thinke he did so pitiouslie complayne
that, wherevnto he knewe well he was
deigned of God, & of his owne most willing
purpose he offered him selfe: yea that he
should be so deiected in mind only for his
bodily stripes inflicted by the Iewes, God
forbid we should think him so faint har-
ted, as before I haue proued. Neither did
he amplifie or paint out his sufferings *poeti-
cally*: this were vanity in him, & madnes in
vs to think. Therefore it is certē, he neither
sung nor said these words to any such mea-
ning at all. Sometime they think, he here
meant to answer the Iewes most disdain-
full mockes & skornes, in telling the that
all this their indignity towards him, was
propheesied of before, namely in *psal. 22.*
whose beginning he repeated to them, as
it were to sende them thither, where they
should see theselues & their doings pain-
ted out long before. Which sense is most
absurd. As if when they had mocked and
reuiled him at noone, or before, he would
then

Pag. 51.

Obiection.

Answer.

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 67

then 3. whole houres after tell them of such
an answer in y^e prophet. This is to fond to
be spoken. But it *appeareth to be euē so; ^{† Mar. 15. 33.}
three whole hours, if not more, after their ^{34.}
mocks it was, that he cryed *my God, my God,*
why hast thou forsaken me. Sometime againe **Obiection.**
they thinke he spake not this of his owne
person, but of his mysticall body the
Church, complayning that nowe his Apo-
stles and the rest should be forsaken, as it
were, being bereft of him. This is no lesse
absurde then the former. There is no ne-
cessitie, nay no cause, nor likelihoode in
the world, that [wee] here should be taken
figuratiuelie for his *Church*. Therefore it
must tbe literal. Againe, he can not com-
plaine so dolefullie that his *church* should
be now forsaken, *viz.* for his bodily want,
seing he had armed them for that before,
& told them that it should be * better for
them that he went, then to tarrie. Where-
by they should receyue a greater comfort
then his bodilie presence could yeelde
them. And lastlie, hee had thoroughlie
& commended them to the protection of ^{† Ioh. 17. 1.}
his Father, that it may seeme altogether ^{&c.}
vnseasonable nowve, in an other more
waightie busines to bee thus disquieted
with this care. There is no reason or like-
lyhood for it. Sometime they thinke, it
maye signifie *compassion* for his Countre-
men the Iewes: who did now to him, they
knew not vvhat, and yvere shortlie after

Answers

† Signifying
the person of
himselfe.

* Ioh. 16. 7.

Obiection.

Answer.

¶ Math. 23 37

to be all utterly rooted out and destroyed for slaying *the Lord of glory*. This is no less but rather more fond & absurd, then the other. For though hee had no doubt at wayes a moste tender *compassion* euen towards his enemies, and specially towards his whole nation, yet that [*me*] here should signifie *my whole nation* there is no sense or reason in it. Neither had hee forgotten that care particularly in [†] another place as it were wholly appointed for it, where hee most tenderly *wept* about it: but neither there, nor any where complained to God why hee would now cast off his people, seeing he knewe perfectly Gods will in this point, that it should be so.

Obiection.

Answer.

Lastly they thinke those words are to expresse Chrestes sorrow for our sinning. Let vs see: how could Christ conceiue due sorrow for our sinning but by measuring it by the wrath of God against sinne? If he thus measured his sorrowe, then hee must know exactly Gods wrath due to sinne, if due to sinne, then due to himselfe, for *hee was made sinne for vs*. And so hee could not conceaue due sorrowe for our sinnes, but he must knowe, and feelee it, proceeding from the wrath of God for sinne vpon him. And such a sorrow indeed of a *broken and contrarie hart* is the onely true and perfectly accepted *sacrifice* to God: and in effect it is nothing but what wee affirme. If they meane nothing els but a religious and

and voluntary griefe in Christ arising at
the cogitation of our secure and wanton
sinning, without any feeling in himselfe
of Gods iust wrath due to the same, which
might bee as it were *a zeale* in Christ and
nothing els, then certainly this pertaineth
nothing to the sacrifice of Christs *passion*,
which he hath heere in hand, but only to
the other parte his *moral obedience* and ful-
filling the righteousnes of the lawe in af-
fection of minde, as wel as in action of bo-
die. So that this ought not to haue any
place heere: seeing questionlesse these
wordes *my God my God, why hast thou forsaken*
me, doe directly and immediatly expresse
some notable parte of his *passion* and not
of his *righteousnes* and holy minde. Againe
how could these words hange togeather,
when he meaneth to tell his Father howe
zealous he is for his glory to say *my God my*
God, why hast thou forsaken me. Surely there is
no fashon in them, thus signifying.
Therefore it resteth they must needs sig-
nifie simply and plainly (as they doe) that
nowe Christ felt him selfe *forsaken* in the
bearing of his intollerable sorrowes for
sinne: that is not succored at this instant
by the comfortable assistance of his *God-
head*, which of purpose withheld it selfe
for a season in his passion, that hee might
thoroughly accomplish this perfit sacrifice
answerable to the seuerer iustice of God,
which thereby he turned away from vs.

Obiection.

Answer.

*Ioh. 12. 27.

Obiection.

*Act. 3. 25.
out of Psal. 16
12.

Neither let anie saye, This *forsaking* can not be without Gods *hatred*, and *separation* from God. It may verie easilie: As a tender and most louing Father will sometimes sharpelie punish his childe, and then nothing but a bitter countenance to him, and so hide his loue that there shall appeare to the child no token of fauor, nor good wil, and yet in deede he neuer meaneth to cast away his childe, but in due time wil cherish him againe. Euen so was it betweene Christ and his Father, Which his Manhood was not able to endure, & therefore euen by a meere *naturall* desire prayed that it might cease, and pitiously complained when it ceased nor. I say by a meere *naturall* desire, not sinfull: Because when his minde was *astounded* at the furious violence of this vnspokeable horror, then in the instant he leaned to *natures* *instinct*, desiring (without sinne) rest, and being to it selfe, and not destruction. The like also was his *fear* before in the Garden, and in the *foreast* of his passion. This was, I saye, a *naturall* *fear*, not a religious *fear*, nor a mistrustfull *fear*, nor a damned *fear*, but properly a very *naturall* *fear*, which well may be without sinne, as is aforesaid. Nay the scripture denieth this *fear* in Christ, as some thinke. I be-
held the Lorde alwayes before me, for he is at my right hande that I should not stagger, or be shaken.
 Heere it is expresse saide, Christ did not
 so

so much as *shake* or *flagger*, no not at *anie* time. Therefore he had no such doubtfull feare, or fearfull doubting when his passion appoched: neither in deede could it be without some diminution of faith, patience, and obedience in Christ, whiche God forbid. In deede God forbid that: farre be it from vs to think any the least diminution in Christ of his faith, patience or obedience to God. But I saye againe, there are two kindes of *shakinge* and *wauering*: either in trust and confidence of Gods loue and protection towards him: Herein we affirme Christ was not touched. Another *shaking* there is meere naturall, a confounding of the powers of the minde and the senses of the body: with a naturall effect following thereon, that is, abhorring of payne, speciallie being furious and extreame. This was in Christ in asmuch as he had true *nature*, & was passible like vs. I say, thus the powers of nature in him might bee confounded, when an infinite burthen of sorrowe lay vpon him, and his memorie might be disturbed, and then nature desiring and wishing suddenlie ease and rest, hee might suddenlie vtter somewhat, which els reason in him would haue controuled: whiche quicklie it did agayne, we see in saying: *Yet not my will, but thine bee done*, as it were, suddenlie comming to him selfe againe. If yet anie stande vppon this,

Answer.

Obiection.

That he beheld the Lorde alwayes, not sometime only or for the most parte, but *alwayes* before him, and therefore could neuer be so astonished. It is ridiculous to stretch that al-

Answer.

wayes so farre: it being meant, that Christ neuer lost his confidence in God: Which they doe not, who by some violence are stricken into astonishment, or naturally fall on sleepe. Their faith, patience, loue, obedience, decreaseth not in them for all that. Euen so, neither in Christ, his assurance in God, could neuer decay: albeit his sinlesse nature might and did feare the paine, & being astonished with excessive paine might and did suddely desire ease.

Obiection.

But this is great curiositie, yea presumption to affirme what Christ nowe feared, and what he felt: as if one should take vpon him to tell what Moses and Elias said to Christ in his transfiguration. Surely,

Answer.

yea, it is curiositie alike indeed. For when Luke telleth vs, we may presume to tell it againe, and affirme what it was. **They spake of his departure which he should accomplishe at Ierusalem.* Euen so when all the Euangelistes tell vs by Christes owne wordes what hee feared, and what he felt, we may well pre-

Luk. 9. 31.

*Elegon ten ex-
odon autou hen
emelle pleron
en Hierusalem*

sume to affirme it. **Matthew and Luke tell vs, that it was to drinke of his Fathers Cuppe,* which he feared, & in fearing felt: yea further it is expressed that God forsooke him.

† Math. 27. 46

† *And there-
fore knowne to
himselfe.*

Marke and Iohn doe call it an hower. What is that hower, but this his appointed suffering

ing for sinne? This was it then, without
all question, that draue him into these his
most wonderfull and pitious agonies, feares,
prowres, miseries, outcries, teares, astonishment,
forgetfulnes, and confusion of the powers of
nature, as before is declared out of the
verie Scripture. Therefore *this Cuppe*, and
this hower, this *forsaking* of God, can not bee
only a *bodily death*, but a more intollerable
suffering that so afflicted him, euen the
verie sense of the wrath of GOD due to
our sinnes which he susteyned. And this
we neede not feare to say. And so much
for the^e second argument, out of these wor-
des, touching his *fearing* and *shunning* his
passion in such sorte, as we see he did.

* See pag. 40

An other Argument is taken hence also:
Because he was *heard* in his suffering, whi-
che he *feared*, and was deliuered *from it*.
But he was not deliuered from his *bodily*
death, but he felt it indeed: Neither was it
the dominion of death which he *feared*:
for he knew perfectly that he should rise
again. Therefore it was none of all these
that heere is meant which bee *fearing* and
feeling was deliuered *from*. But needes it
was the sence of Gods *curse* for sinne and
his wrath when he forsooke him, wherein
he was *heard*, and deliuered *out*, as before
is declared.

I know the contrarie is vrged euen from Objection
this place thus. That wherein he was *heard*
and deliuered *from by prayer*, he *feared*, but
felt

Answer.

felt not. But Christ was *heard* and delivered by prayer *from* the wrath which he feared. Therefore he felt it not. Nay even therefore he felt it. We denie therefore the first *proposition*. For he was in some sense of it, when he prayed against it and was heard: he had the some foretastes, but the extremitie came after, which he before feared. And finally he being *in* al this, was *heard* (as the *very* worde seemeth to import) and delivered *from* it, that is at least not before he had felt it. Again the very *fearing* of Gods wrath is a *true feeling*, I saye not a *full feeling*, but a *true feeling*. But it is graunted that nowe in this Agonie he *feared* the wrath of God: Therefore he *truelie felt it*. Therefore the quzstion is graunted.

¶ Eise/konfheir
Also Luk. 22.
44.

To feare Gods
wrath is indeed
a feele is in
panto.

Obiection.

Answer.
¶ Them. I. 1.
Amat. in
Behr. 3. 7.
¶ Apo 1. 12. in
labiat.
¶ Act. 23. 10.
¶ Eulaberbis.

Here the *†*Papists doe denie our translation, not yeelding that we should reade *from* [his] *fears*. But let them also consider that this verie worde not only in other Authours, but in the *†*Scripture, is vsed for a *perplexed fears*. Also the Greeke *Preposition apo* signified naturally *from* or *out of*, as we turne it. Finallie the circumstances of this text are most sutable to this meaning, viz. to set out Christes sorowes and feares in his passion. Therefore our translation is true and sounde. But as I sayde, this is not nowe called in question among our selues,

Other

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 75

Other Obiections are left fall, as this : The sufferinge of *Hell* tormentes, is not meritorious : † neither is GOD pleased with any mans *death*. Therefore Christ suffered no such tormentes. This is as good against his *bodily* paines . Bodily paynes *imply* *merit* nor, neither doeth God *simply* delight in his creatures *bodily* death. But God is delighted with the execution of *justice* both on our bodyes and soules. And further, Christs sufferings are not as the sufferings of other creatures. All that he suffered was truly and properlie *meritorious*, yea his sufferinge of Heilish tormentes proceeding from the wrath of his iust Father. No other creatures such suffering can be, but his was infinitelie *meritorious*, because of the infinite excellency of his Godhead, being one person with his manhood. Thus farre hereof.

Now to goe on: I proue these sufferings of Christ further in these wordes: * *Throug death he abolished him that had the power of death, that is the Diuell. I say, If this death beere spoken of bee speciallie the death of the soule, then Christ suffered the death of his soule, whereby hee destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Diuell. But death heere is speciallly taken for the death of the soule: Therefore Christ suffered the death of his soule, that is the wrath of God. This reason will seeme altogether vnreasonable, and harsh in the eares of*

Obiection.

Ezec. 33. 18.

Answer.

6.

* Heb. 2. 14.

of some, to say the least of it. But let them soberly consider it, and it is most true and evident. First we meane not that his soule was *mortall* and perished, or came to nothing, as the soules of beastes doe, such death is not meant, when wee speake of the soules death: But the *death* which soules immortall can suffer. Note therefore the bodily *death* is taken two wayes, and accordinglye the † soules *death* is takē two wayes also. First, *death* stricktly, and properly taken, is the verie separation of the soule from the body: and so the soules *death* is the separation of Gods fauour & grace from it. Thus Christes soule dyed not: it were impious in deede, and blasphemous so to say, yea it was impossible so to be. But besides this sense, *death* is often vsed otherwise, as when we saye, *He suffered a bitter death, a painfull death*, wee meane not now the verie separation which is death in deed. For death in deed is senselesse, quiet, and without paine: the body beeing dead in deed hath no more griefe: What then is this *bitter death paynfull death*? Surelie it is the feelinge of the paines and pangs of death, which do procure and bring on, and foreshewe death insuing. Yea men liuing being surprised with grieuous sorrowes and paynes, vwill saye * *they dye, they perish, &c.* And further, that is called *death* sometymes which is such a suffering of hurt and payne, as maketh

† The Soules
death of 2.
sortes.

* Terme: *Death*
di: *perij*: into
vj.

hath a body seeme † quite dead, and yet is
not. So likewise the *death* of the soule
sometimes may be vnderstood, and that
most fitlie for the paynes and sufferinges
of Gods wrath whiche * alwayes accom-
panie them that are *separated* from the
grace and loue of God. Now this *death* of
the soule we affirmet Christ suffered, that is,
the wrath of God, and the horreur of his
seuere iustice, like them who be separa-
ted in deede from the grace and loue of
God, yet him selfe neuer separated, but
alwayes most intirelie beloued, as is be-
fore declared.

Some will say, *death* heere in this text
may signifie Christes bodily death, wher-
by he *abolished* the Diuell & all his power
ouer vs. That can not be here, seeing *death*
being twice heere named, the latter with
a referēce to the former, surelie this word
death hath the same meaning in both pla-
ces: verie fonde it were to take it here o-
therwise. Nowe it is questionlesse in this
latter place *death* signifieth the *death* of the
soule, the tormentes and sorrowes of the
damned, whiche are separated from the
life of God: of which *death* the Diuell is
saide to haue the power and execution,
and we (in the next verse) to be in the feare of
this *death* before our *deliuerance*. There-
fore in the former place *death* signifieth so
too, euen the death of the soule, that is,
the tormentes and sorrowes due to the
dam-

† A.C. 20. 9. 10

Alwayes with
narily.

† Extravag-
narily.

Obiectio.

Answer.

Vet. 15.

What death of
the soule Christ
suffered.

damned proceeding from the iustice and wrath of God: by which death Christ is deed abolished him that had the power of the same death, that is the Diuell.

7.

¶ Thanatō heis
men sarki? oō-
pōiō heis dō iō
pneumati.

* 2. Cor. 13. 4.

† Act. 2. 24.

* Rom. 1. 3. 4.

Lastely in 1. Pet. 3. 18. That Christ in his suffering for vs was † *done to death in the flesh, but made alieue by the Spirite.* In this place the Spirite signifieth the almighty Spirit of God whereby, hee that was *done to death* was made alieue againe, according to these Scriptures: * *He was crucified concerning his infirmities, but liueth through the power of God, † and When God raysed vp loosng the sorrowes of death, * and According to the fleshe hee was made of the seed of David, but according to the Spirite by the resurrection from the dead hee was mightely made manifest to bee the Sonne of God.* And thus the Spirite heere in Peter also signifieth the Godhead, whereby Christ put to death, was raised to life againe. Yet for al this some take Spirit heere to be Christes humane Soule, which certainly can not bee: seeing then Peter must say, *He was made alieue* either in his soule, or els by his soule. But both these are absurd, and most false, that Christ was made alieue either in his humane Soule, or by the same. Therefore the Spirite heere is his Deity, by the which after his death hee was made alieue indeede. Again, when soeuer in Scripture the Flethe and the Spirite are opposed together, the Spirite is neuer for a Humane Soule: and in Christ it is alwayes his Deitie, And then the Fleth

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 79

Flesh also is alwayes Christes whole Humanity: I say not his Body only, but his Soule also, euen his intire and whole humanity. As also that word † *Infirmities* before noted, doth likewise signifie. From hence now it followeth, that Christs Soule also dyed and was crucified according to the death and crucifying. Which soules are subiect vnto and capable of, that is the feeling of Gods wrath, as I shewed a little before. I say the reason is, because not one parte of Christes manhood but both parts euen his whole and intire manhood is heere manifestly meant, where it is said, *He was done to death, or made to dy in the Flesh*. If yet there be any doubt against this sense, we shal haue fitter place afterward, in our next question to confirme it better. Some other frivolous obiections are made as *Hell* is not in this life, Therefore Christ suffered not *Hell*. *Hell* is the burning of Materiall fire, Christ suffered no materiall fire. Therefore Christ suffered not the paines of *Hell*. If Christ were in *Hell*, then holines, faith, patience, and all goodnes may be in *Hell*. But only the contrary is there. Therefore Christ suffered not the paines of *Hell*.

† 2. Cor. 13-4

Obiection.

I answer first † as in the entrance I noted. If we speake of *Hell* in the vsuall and proper sense as it is the very fittest place for the tormenting of the damned, or the veriest estate and condition of the damned: So none of vs euer meant that Christ was there

Answer.

† Pag. 33.

there, or felt any thing therein. But vnderstanding thereby *the seuerer wrath of God* due to sinne, which may well bee called *Hell* by comparison, seeing the sorrows and horrors of Gods fire wrath are equal to *Hell*: So wee affirme, Christ was in *Hell* euen in this life, he suffered *Hell* for vs, or rather *Hells* sorrows. Orherwise then so we neuer thought. Therefore it is greater iniquitie, yea plaine *sophistry* to amplifie against vs, & to make this most hoily truth odious with the people, onely by the ambiguity of the word *Hell*. Know therfore *Hell* as we take it, (that is the sense of Gods wrath) is euen in this life, found sometime. As *Heauen* is likewise, that is, some vnspokeable foretaste of the infinite joy prepared for the Godly hereafter: as † appereth: *The thinges which eye hath not seene, nor eare hath heard, neither came into mans heart, which God hath prepared for them that loue him, the same hath God reuealed vnto vs by his Spirit, for the Spirit teacheth all thinges, yea the deep thinges of God.* Thus you see, as there is *Heauen* euen in this life in some measure: euen so there may bee *Hell*. Yea wee haue shewed it * before in *Iob* and *Jonah* & *Dauid*, &c. And as for the wicked, they many tymes finde it farre more intollerable, as only *Cain* for the rest, will serue to testifie. Oh saith he, † *my finnes*, that is my horror for my sinnes, *is heauier then I can beare.* Now, *Christ* I doubt not, as touching the

† Cor. 2. 9. 10

* Psal. 46.

† Gen. 4.

vehement

vehemency of paine, was as sharply touched euen as the reprobates themselves, yea if it may bee more extraordinarily, being herevnto he was ordayned of God, and the *Godhead* as it were layed it vpon him, euen to the satisfactiō of his seuerer iustice. Further as touching *materiall fire* in Hell what a toyish fable is that: then say aswell there is a *materiall worme* in the conscience that dyerh not, *materiall brimstone* and *much wood* which the fire burneth vpon: All which the Scripture affirmeth like as it doeth the *fire*. But who seeth not that the scriptures, as their vse is, do here vnder materiall and known things, teach vs inuisible and spirituall matters, which by their effects are like to them, euen as horrible and intollerable as they, and so most fitly resembled by them. And els I pray how may the Soules of the damned suffer by *materiall fire* seing they are *Spirits*, and therefore with them and *fire materiall* there can be no communion. But let it be as it may be. The locall *Hell* of the damned we speake not of, neither I trust shall we euer knowe it. And therefore consequentlie here is no preiudice to the heauenlie vertues of Christ.

And thus there is nothing worth naming against the sufferings of *Christ* to be equall to the verie *Hells* torments in vehemencie of paine and sharpenes. The excellencie of which most *Christian doctrine* may be

F fur-

further noted by these consequences.

1.
*Christian reasons according
to Godlynesse,
which require
also that Christ
should suffer
the wrath of
God.*

First it were a mightie terrifyng of
and a strong pulbacke from suffering
martyrdome for Christes trueth. Seeing
by the storie of his passion in the Gospell
there appeareth no such barbarous and
exquisite tormentes inflicted on Christes
bodye when hee suffered for me, as now
my furious and beastlie aduersaries, are
like to inuent and inflict on me for him.
Also if he, feeling nothing but bodily
smart, yet was so dismayed and so feare-
full, yea so confounded as it were in it,
howe shall I, most weake wretch, hope to
susteyne and suffer victoriously these
dreadfull tormentes inuented for me, yea
know not whether Sathan peraduenture
withal will conflict with my conscience in
the midst of myne intollerable paines
which if Christ tasted not of, how shall I
wretch, be so venturous, as to put my self
into them, and hope to out stande them.
And so by this meanes what courageous
Christian, entering into these thoughts,
would not vtterlie shrink, & cease to suf-
fer for Christ. Further, we could not so
well haue knowne howe extreame the
Lord hateth and punisheth sin, as now he
sheweth vs. Seeing his own Sonne could
not scape, but in that hee would deriue
our sinns from vs to him self, euen there-
fore he should smart for it in the highest
degree: and the Fathers iustice should be

2.

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 83

er seuerer on him, as on anie reprobate.
 But if it were not so, then it might come
 into our mindes, the Lorde can and will
 qualifie his iustice where he loues: & then
 we may pittie mee, and so manie infinite
 thousandes mo, who all of vs euen of na-
 ture comit sins, yet are his own creatures.
 Againe, hereby his victorie & triumph
 ouer sinne & death, is infinitely the more
 glorious, in hauing suffered first, such ex-
 treame humiliation, rather then if he had
 had but a light & easie combat. Also the
 exceeding loue of God towards vs is the
 notabler set out. For the more he deba-
 sed & punished his owne most deare Sone
 for vs, the more wonderfully & unspeak-
 ablie he loued vs. Lastlie, heerein a farre
 greater comfort and assurance remaineth
 for vs, considering what great thinges he
 hath done and suffered for our sakes, ra-
 ther then if he had endured none such.
 For thus we neede not feare that any iort
 can nowe remayne vnpayd by Christ, but
 we are assured that all is finished, and that
 no whit shall henceforth be layed to our
 charge, being by his grace acquitted from
 such extremities.

Nowe whereas some saye, The little-
 nes of Christes suffering doeth more sett
 out the power and vertue thereof, when
 as onlie by his bodye, both our Soules
 and Bodyes are fullie ransomed: that is
so much with so little.

Obiection.

Answer, it is nothing so: for then he might more haue appeared, if only he had shed a drop or two of his blood, and not so much, and had felt a stripe or two and not so many woundes, and but some one crosse and that for a short while, but not a life of miseries, & a death of incomparable sorrows, as the wisdom of God appointed that he should and he did suffer. Therefore this reason is but vanitie, and all such like against our assertion.

And hitherto it sufficeth to haue taught from the Scriptures *That Christ suffered for vs both in his soule and body the wrath of God, & Hellish torments, to ransom vs from the same.*

Objection.

Answer.

Note.

Note.

Now because it is stoutly said that the contrarie hath alwayes bene beleeued in the Church, and our opinion neuer known this 1400. yeares, It shall not be amisse to confute this notorious vntruth by the testimony of Godly men in sundry ages since. First taking this by the way, that if they they somewhere seeme variable herein, they doe but shew what they are, that is indeed not fit to be brought as the vmpieres of causes in controuersie, nor iudges of the Scriptures sense, how soeuer yet they are profitable to helpe vs in the way, if we leane not to them wholly, nor yet despise them wholly. Noting this withall, that it is no meruayle if this doctrine were not so plainly vttered nor so fully set downe in former times, as nowe
of

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 89

state it hath bin, because we neuer finde
to haue bin directly in questiō, as lately
we haue scene it to bee. And therefore in
these later times doubtles it hath bin bet-
ter sifted, and more persiclie taught, then
ouer heeretofore since the Apostles age.

Howe so euer it be, thus saierh * *Ieroms:*
Quod (maledictum) nos pro vobis debeamus
sceleribus sustinere, ille pro nobis passus est, pacifi-
ans, &c. The same (Curse) he suffered for vs, which we
should haue borne for our owne finnes.

Testimonies
of the Ancients
Writers.

* *Com. in Isa.*
cap. 53.

† *Cyprian: Dicendo, Quare derelictus sum, indi-*
cat anxietates illius quarummoda Verba esse deli-
ctorum suorum, quorum personam & causam
assumpsit. Per Moysen & Apostolum sustinuit vo-
cari Peccatum & Maledictum, pro similitudi-
ne pœnz, non culpa: quod pro eis voluit intelli-
gi, qui deseri à Deo propter peccata meruerant.
In saying, Why hast thou forsaken me, hee sheweth the
sorrows of that his complayning to be the wordes of his
finnes, whose person and case he tooke vpon him. He was
content to be called by Moses and the Apostle, Sinne and
a Curse, because of the likenes of the punishment, not of the
fault. And this he would haue vs to knowe that it was for
them, or in their steede, who by reason of their finnes, de-
stroyed to be forsaken of God.

† *De Passione*

* *Ambrose: Ego autem non solum excusandum*
non puto, sed etiam nusquam magis pietatem eius
masestatemq; demiror. Minus enim cōtulerat mi-
hi, nisi meum suscepisset affectum. Ergo pro me do-
lens, qui pro se nihil habuit quod doleret: Et seque-
strat à delectatione Dimisit atq; aterna, ratio mea
infirmis atq; afficitur. Marorem anima nostra, sua
anima morore aboleuit. I doe extreme Christ (in this
his suffering) not only not to be excused, but also in deed I
doe no where more admire his gracious loue and his Maie-
stie.

* *Com. in Luc.*
22. De tristitia.
dolor. &c.

et Or, taken on
him my affe-
ctions.

tie. For he had done lesse for me, if he had not ^{as} he
affected as I should have bene. Therefore he sorrowed
me, as hauing nothing to be grieved at for him selfe. As
the ioye of his eternall Godhead being sett a side, hee was
troubled with the tediousnes of my infirmitie. Hee aban-
shed the sorrowe of our soule by the sorrowe of his soule.

* In Cap 23. de
commendatione
Spiritus, &c.

And * againe, *Deus, Deus meus quare dereliquisti me? Clamauit homo Diuinitatis separatione moriturus.* O God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? The Man Christ did crye, his Godhead being departed away, & he about to dye. He meaneth the Godhead was departed from him, not utterly in deed, but touching any comfort or strength that he felt of it then when he was left in his most grievous sorrowes.

† De incarnationis Sacramento. Cap. 6.

Againē † he saith, *Hoc in se obtulisti Christus, quod induisti: Et induisti quod ante non habuisti.* Christ offered that in sacrifice which he assumed: & he assumed all that, which before he had not. That is to say his Soule was offered as a sacrifice, and not his body only.

* Contra Praxeam,

Tertullian likewise saith, * *Quid de isto quæris? Habes ipsum exclamantem in passione, Deus meus, Deus meus, Ut quid me dereliquisti? Ergo Filius patiebatur à Patre derelictus: hac vox carnis & anima, id est Hominis, non Sermonis nec Spiritus est.* What inquire you of him? You hear him crying out in his passion, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? The Sonne therefore suffered, being forsaken of his Father: but this is meant of the Flesh and of the Soule, that is, of the Manhood, not of the Godhead. If any boiect, that which followeth, *Relinquit à Patre, mori fuit Filio.* This forsaking of the Father, is but that the Sonne dyed. Hee meaneth heere that death which was awarded for sin: that is, both of the Soule and Flesh.

† De rectitud. ad Theodas.

† *Cyrill* also, *Carnem quidem suam in redemptionis precium pro carne omnium impendens, & animam suam similiter pro omnium animarum redemptionis precium constituens.* He bestowed his Flesh as a ranfome for our flesh: likewise he made his Soule a price of redemption for our Soules.

Thus

SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. 27

Thus much haue we of the ancient Writers, and much more no doubt, as they know who are better conuersant in them then my selfe. Howbeit this sufficeth to shewe that they held, *Christ to haue suffered properly in his Soule for our finnes*, and that *his Soule was made an Offering and price of redemption*, & not his flesh only. Yea that *his Soule felt the separation of the Godhead in his person*, and that he withdrew at that time *all comfort from the same*, and so susteyned *the same Curse, the like punishment*, which we should haue done. Wherefore surelie the ancient times since the Apostles haue also known and taught and beleueed euen that which we teache, and beleue in this behalfe.

There are also some of the modestest *Papists* that here doe ioine with vs likewise.

But to come to the *Protestant Writers*, lett this be chieflie noted: I doe not say some of them, or the most, or the best, but all & euery one both *Churches* and *Writers* in the world, who are *Protestantes*, teache as we do. Neuer was there any voyce heard any where openly to the contrarye, before nowe in *Lodon* of late. Except only the whotest and cunningest *Papistes*, *Iesuits*, *Priestes*, and *Fryars*, who in deed alwayes vntil this day, haue had this controuersie with all *Protestantes*, & all *Protestants* against them. As *Bellarmino*, & *† Campian*, principall *Iesuites*, doe testifie, ** Fenardentius* the *Fryar*, and our *Rhemish Seminarie Priestes*.

** Cusanus in Ps. 30.*

Fernus in Mat. 26.

Note.

† Anno 1597.

“Tom. 5. Com.

3. Lib. 4. cap. 8.

† Rat. 8.

** De Christo*

Patient. Dia-

log. 5.

“ Annotat. in

Mat. 27. 46.

Heb. 5. 7.

In whom, and specially in *Bellarmino* and *Few* *ardentius* we finde the very arguments and reasons, or rather the silly sophismes which it hath pleased some among vs to gather together, & to paint the with faire colours, and to scatter them in England as precious stuffe. Now lastly if we looke to our selues in *England*, al our worthy Preachers & Writers hitherto haue bin cleane contrary always. Mr *Fulk* in his answer to *ſ Rhemists*: † Mr *Deering*, whose name is still reuerend in London: Mr *Whitakers*, a noble light in our Churches of late, *saith thus: *Erat Deus nobis propter peccatū iratissimus, Christus se interposuit, causā suā cum omnem in se unum effusam sustinuit. Quis ergo Christum nihil (huiusmodi) sensisse putat, & peccatū magnitudinem & Dei iustitiam, & Christi meritum tollit. Quod non fuerit absorptus, Deo atq; tribuendum est* God was most wrathfull with vs for sinne: Christ put him selfe betwene, and susteyned all alone the whole vehemencie of his wrath poured vpon him. He therefore that thinketh Christ felt not (any such thing) doeth take away the grievousnes of sinne, the iustice of God, & the merit of Christ. It was because of his Godheads assistance, that he was not overwhelmed and swallowed vp quite.

And besides these, many other most excellent men, and namely Mr *Nowell* in his "Catechisme is so pregnant in this point, as no mā liuing is more. This Catechisme is authorised in a whole Synode, and commanded to be raught to all our youth in *England*. Also our great Bible appointed by Authority to be read in publick Churches expresse saith as much. Is not this

now

at Answer to
the Rhem. Te-
stam. in Mat.
27. 46. and
Heb. 5. 7.
† Lottur. in
Hebr.
* Contr. Dura.
pag. 558.

et On the arti-
cle of the Creed
He descended
into Hell.
† Syn. Lond.
Anno 1571.
* Annotat. in
Luke 22. 44.

Now our English Churches expresse & constant doctrine, it beeing neuer repealed since? Yes verily. Considering also that the now Archbishop of Canterbury with 3. other great men haue expressly given it this allowance. Howsoever of late he hath by his letters allowed Mr. Bilsons contrary doctrine that it might be printed, albeit yet it proceeded not. To conclude, I will adde now finally the consent not of one or two, nor of our Churches in England simply, but of our publike Lawes of the Realme, that it may thoroughly appeare our doctrine to be the publike authorized doctrine of England. The booke of Homilies, established by Act of Parliament hath thus: "In the beginning of the Homil. of the Passion, or presently after, setting down certaine partes & degrees of Christs passion, first how he delivered him self of his heauely glorie, and debased him self to the condition of a man, yea of such a man as was subiect to many infirmities & disgraces, by & by he cometh to his death on the Crosse, as the last and greatest part of his suffering. The which he expresth thus, He put him self betwene Gods deserved wrath & our sinne. Where this being expressly made a part and degree of Christs suffering for vs, it followeth that the Homelie expressly teacheth Christ suffered the wrath of God for vs as a parte of his Passion, & price of redemption. Againe it saith, * He

† In the Admonit. to the people of Engl. pag. 66.

* As it is certainly reported

† Eliz. An. 18 cap. 12.
" Homil. 2. of the Passion

† Euen as also M. Whitaker useth this phrase pag. 22.

* Homil. 2. of the Passion.

sooke

† *Gen. 2. 17.*

tooke vpon him the iust reward of sinne. The reward is that which Gods law appoints against sinne: which is the death of the Soule (as it is called) in deede the feeling of the fierce wrath of God, & not the bodily death only. Thus seeing also by the Hom. sentence, *Christ tooke vpon him the reward of sinne*: Surely the doctrine of our Churches publiklie allowed by Lawes in England, doth plainly auouch that Christ suffered the wrath of God for vs. And who soeuer saith nay, he resisteth, yea hee doth praueth* the doctrine of Christ authoritatively in Englande.

*In saying it is
hereticall, im-
pious, and blas-
phemous.

And here is it likely (Christian brethren) that all the late holy men of God should hitherto vniuersally erre, and only the Papistes, their Iesuites, their Fryars, & traitorous Priestes, haue the trueth herein against vs? In this so greate a light of the Gospel, as lately hath shined out of darkness, and in this so waightrie, & religious cause? I say, is this likely by anie meanes? Neither hath this point ben couered in silence, but namely and particularly sifted and tried to the quick, and alwayes notably approoued & determined euery where against the Papistes. What iniurie then is this to Gods Church, for one that professeth himself a friend, to agree with none in such a case, but with the enemies thereof? But let it be possible that all Protestants hitherto haue herein erred, & now some

one

one or two of them beginne to spy the
truth out of *Belarmine*: I will not simply
denie, but this is possible to be, although
nothing more vnlikelie. Yet is this likely
that only the authour of this cōceit with
him, a man of wealth, plenty, and worldlie
honour, should haue this singular trueth
reuealed vnto him, before all the rest of
our most worthy laborers in Gods church
this many yeares, who were certainlie, in
all mens reason, farre likelier for diuers
respects to discerne of the feelings of cō-
science, & of the wrath of God for sinne:
& so consequentlie might he or they see
better, how needful it was that the Sonne
of God should tast thereof, or not, to free
vs therfrom? Surely I must needes saye, to
think him the likeliest of all other which
haue gone before, and yet are, most singu-
lar lightes, to finde out this doctrine for
vs, that point verily I can neuer admit, al-
beit I iudge him not, nor any man. Only I
hope, I haue sufficientlie cleered this our
first quæstion, and proued it by the Scrip-
tures, that *Christ hath suffered for vs the wrath
of God* to redeeme vs from it. The which
I wholly submit to the iudgement of the
Godly, desiring them only to consider,
what I haue before written: which also
most gladlie I doe in all other thinges,
whatsoeuer hereafter I do, or shall write.

THAT

THAT CHRIST AFTER
 HIS DEATH ON
 the Crosse, went not
 into Hell in his
 Soule.

THis wee ought also in *Christian faith* to beleeue, *that Christ after his death on the crosse, went not into Hell as has said*. And heere because that article of our comon Creed wilbe objected straigh against vs, *He descended into Hell*, we will by Gods helpe firste make plaine this article according to Christian verity & the Scriptures sence: Secondly we will proue our assertion by the Worde, that Christ went not into *Hell* after his death on the crosse.

*Teaching the
 common Creed
 called the A-
 postles Creede
 what we are to
 acknowledge.*

Ad Trail:

And first to say somewhat in generall of our common Creed vsually called the *Apostles Creed*: we acknowledge it to be an excellent short summe of Christian faith: wherein are all the necessarie and chiefe heades of saluation comprised, and nothing but is consonant to the Apostles doctrine, beeing taken aright. Also wee acknowledge it so ancient, as if the Godlie Christians gathered it not in the Apostles times, yet certainly, it was very soone after them. For *Ignatius* runneth vpon the very articles of this Creede: *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, doe shewe likewise that such a rule of faith was ancientlie knowne

knowne before their times. So that wee knowe it could not be made very longe after the Apostles times: I meane if not this whole Creed as now it is, yet surely a great parte of it, and namely this article, *It descended to Hades*, whereof *Ignatius* in the foresaid place doth speake, & others most auncient likewise. For we must know as the trueth is, This Creede was made not all at once, but sundry articles were made and added, some after other as occasion required, til it came to this whole summe and fulnesse, which now it is at. For when by occasion of Heretikes arising and calling in question anie maine pointe of faith, open error beganne to assaile the Church, then the Godly & carefull Christians resisted and armed the people as they could against the danger, then they contriued some short article of faith to be learned and held generally and of the simplest, whereby as it were by one familiar word they might be prepared against the infection then spreading, & so might bee sufficiently grounded in the trueth. This appeareth to be so, not only by the practice of the †ancient Councils, who added to their Creeds words and articles directly against the Heretikes who then troubled the, but even in this also, called the *Apostles Creed* it must needs be so: Seing in the moſte auncient recordes thereof, all the articles are not found full and whole, which

*The common
Creede was
made all at
once.*

† In Nic: Counc.
saunt: Epiph:
¶

94 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**

*The Creede
was not made
by the Apostles*

which after were added, but those onely whereof the Churches had need in those former times. And this is one sure prooffe that this common Creede was not made indeed by the Apostles the selues, because it appeareth (as I said) to haue ben gathered & made parte by parte as the after occasions in the Church required. And though it were called the *Apostles Creede*, yet that verely was only because it agreeth with the Apostles doctrine. Neither could all the Apostles communicate together in making it: Some being presently dead after Christes ascension, and manie scattered farre and wide in the world. And if some of them only made it, their names would haue bene recorded. Finally if it had bin made by the Apostles in deede, then it had bene *Canonicall Scripture*, as well as the newe Testament. But the Creed was neuer so iudged nor beleueed to be *Canonicall scripture*. Therefore it was neuer beleueed of old, neither ought it nowt, to be the Apostles very making. And yet as I said, we knowe it to be most ancient, and very neere to the Apostles tymes: yea this very article of Christes *descending to Hades*. Because *Ignatius* speaketh of it, & others, as I haue aboue rehearsed.

Here then, let all men knowe, we denie not this Article of our Creede, but wee embrace it vnfaignedly, and doe hold it to haue

haue bene profitably added, when it was firste put into the Creede, when and by whom soeuer it was, so that the reason and meaninge thereof bee wiselie and rightly regarded.

And further wee affirme, it hath no darke nor figuratiue meaning nor farre removed from the vsuall phrase of the Greeke language wherein it was written, but it hath a plaine easie & vulgare sense familiar to the vnderstanding of all, that spake Greeke after the true language.

Wherefore it is great iniury now to count vs *Heretikes*, as if wee denied an Article of our faith, for teaching thus much: as some more hastily then wisely haue pronounced.

But you will saye, What phrase, what meaning, and what vse of speech is this that I speake of? Surely it is the proper & vsuall meaning of *Hades* in Greeke that I speake of: that I speciallie require to bee well knowne and regarded: that which indeed openeth the whole present contro- uersie of Christes descending. For this I affirme, it is only the Fathers abusive spea- king, and altering the vsuall and auncient sense of *Hades*, that hath bred this error of Christes *descending into Hell*: their vnapt & perilous translating it into Latin *Infers*, & our naughty and corrupt translation in English *Hell*, hath confirmed the same. And note here this first! It is a thing too rise with

*No darke no
obscure nor dif-
ficulte words in
the vulgare
Creede.*

Note.

*For the right
vnderstanding
of this Arti-
cle, it is neces-
sarie to know
what Hades in
Greeke doeth
properly signifie*

Note.

1. Pet. 5. 3.

with the Fathers, yea with some of the
 ancientest of them to alter and chaunge
 the authentike vse of words, whereby co
 sequently it is easie for errors and gross
 mistakings to creepe in. As *Chirotonia* to
 signifie Ordination of Ministers, when
 signifieth authentically the Peoples gi
 uing of voyces in Election: *Kleros* to sig
 nifie only the Clergie, whē it signifieth
 the Flocke: *Ecclesia* to signifie a *Diocese* or
Prouince of Christians, whē it is alwayes in
 Scripture a *particular Church*, or els in deed
 the *Vniuersall Church*. So the Latines vse *Me
 ritum* to signifie *good workes*, which authen
 tically signifieth *merit* or *desert*: *Claves* the
 Keyes, to signifie only *Church-gouernement*,
 when in Scripture it signifieth alwayes the
 whole Ministeriall power and function,
 the *worde*, *sacramentes*, and *prayer*, as well as
discipline. Euen so truely the Greeke Fa
 thers vse *Hades* and the Latin *Inferi*, to sig
 nifie *Hell* properly & paticularly, that is,
 the place of the Damned: or els an other
 paticular place vnder the earth a part of
Hell, and not farre from *Hell* it selfe, where
 Soules remayned if not in paynes yet in
 prison, and farre frō the place of eternall
 blessednes and ioye: which the later Wri
 ters haue since fondlie named *Limbus Pa
 trum*. Thus I say haue the Fathers written
 and spoken, applying *Hades* and *Inferos* so
 paticularlie to the place for Soules vnder
 the earth, farre frō eternal blessednes,
 But

† The dreame
 of Limbus Pa
 trum.

INTO HELL PROPERLY

97

But this is a meere, and a plaine abusio of these wordes, and specially of our worde most in question, that is *Hades*. They haue much altered and chaged the authentike and true vse thereof. The Classicall Writers the Maisters of the Greeke tongue do vse *Hades* in proper sense only in generall for the state of the dead, the world of the dead, the world of soules departed, indifferentlie and indefinitely meaning as well those in eternall ioyes as those in paines. So that they signifie herein a generall opposition betwene the Liuing & the Dead, not a particular opposition betwene the Damned and the Blessed. Examples hereof in the authentike greeke Authors are frequent. *Plato* the wise Maister * saith thus, speaking in the person of *Socrates*, a litle before his death: *He p'syche ara, to aidei, to ris to uiuon* upon heteron oichomeon, genuaion, kai katharon, kai aide, eis Haden, hois alethos, para ton agathon, hois phronimon Theon: *hoi, an Theos ethele, autika kai se heme p'syche ueon*. The soule being an inuisible thing goeth (hence) to another place like (as it selfe, that is to) a noble place, & pure, and inuisible, even vnto the World of the dead, that is in trueth, to the good and wise God: whether if God will my soule must presently goe. This moste singular place sheweth that *Hades* with them is not properly for Hell, but for the World of the dead, & sometime, as name- lie here, even for Heaven: and that so it is named *Hades* because it is *aidei* inuisible, or hidden fro our eye & sense in this world. We must note then, *Socrates* hopeth not

The true and authentike and familiar sense of *Hades*.

* *Plato in Phaedrus.*

† *eis Haden.*

* *VVhy Hades doth naturally betoken the World of the Dead.*

G

here

98 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**

heere to goe to *Hell*, but to *Heauen* presently after his death: and that is it that he calleth *Hades*. As againe hee affirmeth: *our esont as en hadon has psychas hemion*. Our soules after this life shal bee in *Hades* truly or in very truth. Again he saith of *Heauē*, that it is *aidēs hē hades, hōsser légetas*: an vnseene Estate, even *Hades* as it is (commonly) called. Lastly he speaketh of *ta en Hadon agatha*, of the good things in *Hades*: there is little good in *Hell*. Wherefore it is plaine by *Plato*, *Hades* sometime may be vnderstood of *Heauen*: yea and with the *Grecians* it was a common phrase. Likewise *Plutarch* sheweth of *Leonidas* the Spartan King that most noble defendor of his Countrey, when with a handfull of men he would resist the huge hostes of *Persia*, though he knewe well that himselfe and his were all like to be slaine, as they were in deed, yet hee cheered vppe his men not to feare such a blessed death, saying, *we shall so breake our faste, that wee shall suppe in Hades* not in *Hell*, that were a colde comfort, but amongst the blessed departed. So *Homer* saith, *many noble soules were sent aids to Hades*, not to *Hell*, but to the societie of the happy deceased. And *Stephan** citeth *Plutarch peris ion eusebeion en Hadon*. Concerning the Godlie departed, and being in *Hades*, that is in *Heauen* hee meant, I thinke, not in *Hell*. Therefore the authentike Anthours of the *Greek* tongue did vse *Hades* for the place

* Note, as it is commonly called.

In Parall.

* Iliad. 1.

* Steph. The-
saur. in Hades.

place of the blessed soules also, not pro-
perlie for *Hell*, the place of the damned,
although no man denyeth but some-
time it serueth euen for *Hell* it selfe in-
derder. *Yllyssus* *was* *slain* *at* *his* *owne* *house*.

And that al-
so euen as well
as it is taken
for Heauen. For
both wayes it
is restrained by
a figure: viz.
Synecdoche,
the whole for
the parte.

This were enough to learned and rea-
sonable men for the clearing of the true
and proper sence of *Hades* in Greeke. But
because I feare this question will not so
quickelie ende, it shall serue very well
for the better openinge of the sence of
this Greeke worde, if wee compare the
Latine worde *Inferi* therewith, which
with them was vsed to signifie the same
thinge as *Hades* in Greeke did, albeis in-
deed *Inferi* was not so fit to expresse gene-
rally both the blessed and damned dead
indifferentlie, as anon God willing wee
shall further see.

... of ...
... of ...
... of ...

Nowe firste therefore lett vs compare
and consider likewise the authentike and
proper vse of *Inferi* the Latine as we haue
done of *Hades* the Greeke worde. *Inferi*
with the Latines is vsed authentically as
we haue scene *Hades* is in Greeke, not for
the damned only, but also for the blessed
departed this life: indeed generally for
the world of the dead which by death are
not cleane extinct but do liue somewhere
els in another life. So did *Cicero* meane,
* when he sheweth in latin that encourag-
ments of *Seneca* before touched to his

The authentike
sence of *Inferi*.

* *Tuscul.*
quest. 1.

... also ...

associates, that they should not feare to
 dye for their Countrey; *For si quis effu-*
nam cenabitur frater apud ceteros. Be of good
 cheere (*forte haec*) for it is likely wee shall
 suppe, *where?* in Hell? Nay verily: Nei-
 ther *Louider* nor *Tully* thought so, but ra-
 ther in a place of eternall blessednesse,
 where they beleueed the most worthy de-
 fendours of their Countrey were recey-
 ued, as *Socrates* before saide of him selfe a-
 bout to dye; *para sum agathon kai phronimon*
Thion, with the good and wise God. Yet this place
 he nameth here *Inferos*. Hence also it is
 that *Cicero* sayeth; It is an Oratours part,
 sometime *Loriculosisimos testis ab in Inferis ex-*
citare, to rouse up witnesses from the dead, not from Hell.
 For he meaneth that which him selfe did
 for *Militer* defence, bringing the exaples
 of the worthy and blessed olde defendours
 of the common wealthe, *Hales Serranus, Na-*
ses, Opimius, C. Marius, and *1. Oldes Africani*,
Manius, Paudus, Scipio, and therewo *Duci*,
 whiche woulde greeue at the Common
 Wealthes calamitie; *who any going vnto them*
in illam eternam domum, should tel them of
it. This eternall habitation of the se most no-
 ble dead men called thus to witnesse, was
 not *Hell* in his iudgement, yet generallie
 hereckoned them to bee *apud Inferos*. For
 so thought and so spake the heere Heathens:
 as also *Virgill* dooth, *Drachere inferi latet*, &c.
 Where hee describeth *Elysium* as their
 Heaven, the goodlie Elysian fieldes, the e-
 ternall

in *Bruto*.

in *Orat. pro*
Milon.

Epist. ad
Octav.

Philipp. 1.4.

Enclid. 6.

eternal habitation of the blessed to be *apud inferos*, but not in *Hell*, which in our English tongue is properly the place of the damned only. Who surely though being a Poet, and sayned manie thinges, yet spake he familiarlie and after the vulgar use, also for the substance of his matter, he vttered touchinge *Heaven* and *Hell* the opinion of the worlde then. Which also *Horatius* commenting on the same place doeth shewe, saying: *Veteres Elysium parant in uocem inferorum situm, in qua piorem animam quiesceret. Philosophi in insulis Fortunatis, &c.* The ancient Heathen beliaued their Heauen to be beneath in the wolds of the deid, where the soules of the godly had rest. The Philosophers thought it to be in the Fortunat Ilandes, &c. Hereunto let vs adde, that the latter learned Writers, euen *Christians*, haue also espyed and graunted this propertie of the Latine worde *Infernum* or *inferi*, as also of the Greeke *Hades*. *Jerome* saith, *Infernum* is a place where the soules are included either in rest or paynes. The old Latin Translatour vsesh *Infernum* not only for *Hades* but also for *Thanatos* death, also for *Mors* for *Hades*. So he esteemeth *Hades* and *Infernum* (both theis wordes) for very Death. *Auger*, *Nicolaus* *Sissian* *Scriptura de inferno loquitur quia ut sit communis omnibus tam sanctis quam impijs. Beati autem soli impijs tribuitur.* The scripture nowhere speaketh of *Hades* or *Infernum* but as being common as well to the blessed as to the damned. But *Gehenna* is proper only for the damned. *Lanater* saith, *Hades* *apud Graecos generale vocabulum est. Hades in Greco*

1 In Oso. 13. 18

** Actes 2. 24
† 1. Cor. 15.
55.*

*" In Mat. 23
10.*

** In Eccl. 3
19.*

108 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

is a generall word for the condition of the dead, both in torment and in peace. * Bullinger. To goe ad inferos, is To goe into Abrahams bosome: that is, into heaven, not into Hell. † Zwinglius, *Porta inferorum periphrasis moriendo*. The gates of Death is nothing else but a phrase signifying Death. * Mosler, touching *Sheol, Hades, and Infernum*, sayeth, they doe but signifie that Christ dyed. As if he should say, *Idem latet sum, quia futurum scio, et quanguam mirandum mihi sit, tamen in hunc rediit*. Therefore I reioyce because I knowe, that although I dye, yet I shall rise to life agayne. * De Mat. *Christum descendere ad inferos, nihil aliud indicare, nisi quod eandem subijt statum quem reliqua anima a corpore separata experiri solet*. That Christ descended to the dead signifieth nothing else, but that he did undergoe the same state as other soules doe y depart this life. Thus comparing the Latine *Inferos*, & the Greeke *Hades* together, we see that the ancient and late Anchours doe signifie by them both the generall state of the dead, the world of the dead, conceyning Heaven for the blessed, as well as Hell for the wicked indifferently. Nowe if any marvell at this, and thinke it straunge that *Hades* signifying a dark place, and *Inferos* a place beneath the earth or in the earth, that these wordes I say should any way signifie Heaven, and the blessed soules there. Seeinge all wise men would rather thinke that this is rather Hell, where is utter darknesse: as for Heaven it is certainly a place of glorious brightness, & that on high, not downwards.

* Deud. 1.9

† In Esa. 38.

* In Psal. 16.
10.

* In Symb.

Objection.

wards. I answer: Here in deede is the
 erie occasion of all this error and of all
 the controuersie at this day about Christs
 going downe into Hell. I say the very mi-
 taking of these wordes is, and hath bene
 the cause of all this. As touching *Hades* al
 men graunt, it cometh of the Greeke
hades, and *hades* to see. But here is the er-
 rour: some men take it so as betokeninge
 impossibilitie for vs to see being there, by rea-
 son of darknes and ougly blacknes in that
 place: and the this is likely to be nothing
 but *Hell*. Nay, they are deceyued that giue
 this reason of the Etymologie of *Hades*, if
 they giue it for the full, perfect, and gene-
 rall Etymology, & as being euen with the
 naturall vse of the worde. *Plato* in the
 place aboue cited, who knew it better the
 any of our Contraries, doth giue another
 and a better meaning of this Deriuation:
 Where alluding to *hades* he saith it is *scopos*
hades a place inuisible, a place which here in this worlde
 none can see, an inuisible world. And so the *World*
 of the dead generally and not only *Hell*, is
 thereby properly and naturally noted.
 Which *Tertullian* expresseth thus, *a parti-*
tis orbis communis segregatum, remoued from the
 worldes knowledge. This is certainly the true
 Deriuation of *Hades*; and so it may right-
 lie, true lie, and by a natural emphasis sig-
 nifie *Heaven* sometime, if other Circum-
 stances there doe so require, and not

Answer

* In *Phaedrus*

cc. *Apoc. 6. 8.*

G. 4. *Hell*

* Acts 2. 27.

Objection.

Answer.

Synecdoche.

Hell, as in the former authentike Greeke Testimonies by the very circumstances of the places I haue proued, and euen so also out of question it is taken in the ground of our controuersie, and in the Apostles Creede, where it is said that *Christ being dead went to Hades*, he went to the *World of the dead*, that is namely to the blessed soules in *Heaven*: I say in *Heaven*, not that *Hades* it selfe doth so importe, but because he that dyed was a Blessed man. But some will say, The reason of the deuination of *Hades* from a *primative* and *ride*, to see hath bene iudged otherwise, that is for a *place wher we cannot see*, and then it will followe that it should signifie a *darke place*. I denie not but sometime *Hades* may admit that reason of the *Ezymologie*, and so the Poet alludeth to it *sine luce domus*, a place without light And thus it signifieth, first the *Grave* where is no light: and by a Metaphore fro hence it may be vsed for *Hell*, wher in reason we iudge also that there is ongly darknes, & no light. Thus I say no man doubreth but *Hades* sometime signifieth: but this is neuer vnles, by a figure *Synecdoche* the whole for the parte, the full and iust sense thereof by some manifest circumstance be restrained. The full and iust sense is the generall state of the dead, the world of the dead, as before I haue shewed: so that it rightlie and properly noteth a difference betwene the dead and the liuing, not betwene the

INTO HELL PROPERLY: 105

the damned & the blessed. And yet it is true
this is sometime restrayned as I haue said,
by the circumstances in the place where
we find it and then it is sometime for the
place of the body being dead, sometime
of the soule departed being in Hell: and
sometime also for the place of soules in
Heauen, as I haue declared before also.
So that aboue all things this is to be no-
ted and to bee taken heede of, that wee
restraine not this generall worde *Hades*,
where it neede not to be restrayned: and
moſte of all that wee take it not for *Hell*,
where it may, nay where it moſt ſignifie
Heauen, as in the places of this our maine
controwerſie aforeſaid.

Howbeit notwithstanding all this, com-
pare the Latin *Inferi* with the Greeke *Hades*,
and then I graunt *Inferi* is proner to bring
vs into error then *Hades*. For it is true *In-*
feri commeth of *Infra* which is beneath: and
therefore it ſcemeth there is no other way
but to take it for a place beneath the earth,
or in the earth, and not on high, where it
is to be thought that *Heauen* is & the bleſ-
ſed ſoules doe dwell. All this is true in
deed: yet lee vs heedfullie note notwith-
ſtanding, that this worde *Inferi* in Latin
yſe doeth comprehend all that *Hades* in
Greeke doeth: even the whole ſtate or World
of the dead generally, making * opposition
properly betwene *Superſtites* and *Defunctas*,
the Liuing and the Dead (as before was ſaide of
Hades)

NOTE

Note.

It is eaſie to
ſlip into error
by the uſe of
Latin *Inferi* or
Infernum in
the Creede, un-
leſſe we careful-
lie conſider the
ancient uſe
theroof.

Note.

* Bulling
Dec. 1. 7.

106 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

Hades) without difference of the blessed and damned, vnlesse also some other reason and circumstance doe restrayne the words ancient & proper generalitie. The plaine reason of this, we may learne from Cicerō him self, Saith he ¹ That *inferi* should signifie the state of al the dead both good and bad generallie, it grew of an error of the Ancients, *in terram cadentibus corporibus hisq; humis totis, sub terra consistant reliquias vitam agi, ueritatem.* The old simple ignorant Latines thought when the bodies of men were layed in the earth, their soules also liued the rest of their life under the earth. This they thought of all the dead, both the Blessed and the Damned. And this, sayeth hee, they thought because they knewe not in deepe of the soules of the dead *quid in se habuerant*, in what place they were after death: Cicerō *generatio* saith he further, *fixit inferas, esse formidines, &c.* The ignorance of truth herein, began this opinion that the state and Worlde of the Dead was under the earth; and particularly the terrors of Hell also. And so in deed not the opinion only, but the phrase also whereby they signified this general state and Worlde of the Dead, was iustly & most fitlie, as they thought, from *infra* beneath, or *inferi* and *infernus*. And so they spake also *excitare ab inferis*, to raise vp, not from Hell, but generally and indifferentlie from the Dead: *migrare ad inferos* to goe to the dead, common as well to those whom they beleeued to bee Blessed, as to the Damned, Also thus they beleeued E-

byjus

as Tufcul.
pag. 1.

the Blyssian fields
namely the Gentils Heauen) to bee be-
neath amongst the dead: as already I haue
shewed out of Virgil, Cicero, &c. Now Tully
further sayth of this opinion, *Quam curum
opinionem magni errates commiserunt*: This opini-
on was occasion of many and great errors. In all
which wordes of Cicero I note 3. things. 1.
That he utterly misliked this opinion of
old Latines or whomsoever, that thought
the World of the dead was vnder the earth;
and therefore gaue this terme *Inferis* to sig-
nifie the same. This he openly misliketh,
yea that the damned Soules were beneath
in the earth, or at least such kinde of tor-
ments for the as consequently the former
error did cause many to imagine. Howe
much more did hee condemne them that
thought all deceased soules were beneath,
under or in the earth? The blessed he thought
rather, as Plato did, to ascēd vp to the hea-
uens. Here we must note that the Heathē
held diuersly of their Heauen, the place for
the blessed soules. Some thought it in
the Heauens above, some in the ayre, some
in the Sphere of the moone, and others as be-
fore we heard in the fortunate Island, and
many, specially the common sort, & most
speciallie in the olde times long before,
that it was an oether Region vnder the
earth, as Hell it selfe also was one, but this
cleane distinct & remoued frō that which
they called *Elysium*, as before I obserued

Touching In-
feri in Cicero 3
things to bee
noted.

T. As Tertull.
serueth in lib.
de Anima.

Their Hous

ous

108 **THAT CHAST WENT NOT**
 out of *Virgil*. This last opinion that the
 soules deceased were *under the earth* can
 heere flatly reiecteth. 2. I note in him
 that although he reiecteth this olde fabu-
 lous opinion of the Latines, yet he retain-
 ned the *Latine phrase* as being now comon
 and familiar euery where, *ad inferos*, and
inferos generally for the world of the dead.
 Which phrase arose of old from that opi-
 nion, as namely, thinking all the dead af-
 ter this life to be *in infernall*. He had lea-
 ned to thinke wiselyer, but yet hee spoke
 so as the vulgar phrase had preuailed ac-
 cording to *Aristotles* rule, *Loquendum* &
vulgus, *sapientum* & *sapientes*, we must speake as the
 custome is, but beleeue as the wise doe. So then yet
 this phrase of speech remayned comon,
 though the ground of it euen then was
 held fabulous of diuers. 3. Tully saith, of
 this opinion followed many errors. Nowe
 as hee saith from this opinion amongst
 the Heathen, So I say, from this phrase of
 speech *inferi* receaued amongst Christians,
 but first grounded on the heathnish opin-
 ion, there hath followed many errors in
 the Church. For this worde *inferi* beeing
 vsed amongst the Christians vulgarly and
 familiarly, but taken from the Heathen,
 and the reason thereof not duely confi-
 dented whence it first arose, namely that
 it was an error to thinke the soules of the
 dead were *under the earth*: likewise also
 the Greeke worde *Hades*, when men mi-
 stooke

• Topic.

Note.

The Fathers
 not duely confi-
 dering the right
 vs of *Inferi* &
Hades, gave
 occasion of the
 errors at this
 day about Hell
 and Death.

to take the *Equivocal* of it as meaning a
 place, whether it betokeneth a place
 or a state, as before I have shewed:
 I say both these mistakeings amongst the
 Fathers prevailing, have given occasion
 both to them and vs since of greete and
 grievous errors, & of all this contention
 in the Church heereabout at this day. To
 remedy the which, doubtles the best way
 is well and thoroughly to consider the au-
 thentike vse of these words *Hades* & *Inferi*
 in such sorte as before I have declared.
 And then this will appeare that our En-
 glish word *Hell* which we commonly vse
 for the former Greeke and Latine, it sig-
 nifieth not as differeth greatly, it is much a-
 misse. And specially it serueth not for
Hades, as before I have shewed. For *Hades*
 signifieth an invisible place, and is vsed au-
 thentically for the *World* of the dead in ge-
 nerall; the invisible *World* unknowne to vs heere.
 So that it makes difference not betwene
 the damned and blessed, as some suppose,
 but betwene the dead and the living; but
Hell in English is properly and onely the
 place of eternal torments for the wicked.

Thus hitherto by comparing also the
 Latine *Inferi* and the Greeke *Hades* toge-
 ther, we see now cleerly what the authen-
 tike vse of *Hades* is. And seeing we see it, I
 inferre & affirme boldly, Even so doubt-
 lesse doe the Scriptures speake, so write
 the Apostles, yea the Septuagint Trans-
 lators,

*Hell in English
 no for words to
 expresse the
 Greeke Hades.*

110 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

* Good Gram-
marians.

lators, & all * good Grecians: they varie
not their language fro the vsual, known
current speech which was spoken in
before their times. And if so they doe,
then it remayneth concluded and firme
proved that the Scriptures by *Hades* mean
not *Hell* properly: but the *World of the Dead*
indifferently, or the general state of death,
or the *Power of death*, vnlesse sometime
where special circumstances do restraine
proper & native generality of that word.

Obiection.

But yet this is doubted stil by some, that
denie flatlie the newe Testament to haue
vsed *Hades* anie other way then only for
Hell. These men; what should I saye to
them? You haue heard that the natural
propertie of the word *Hades*, according to
the vse of the authentike Authours, (by
whom euen the Apostles wordes must be
Grammaticallie construed, I suppose)
plainlie refuteth them. Wherefore I con-
stantlie affirme as before, the Scripture
vseth *Hades* neuer properly for *Hell*. And
this I affirme not onely because of the
former authentike consent with mee a-
bout the worde, but also because all the
seuerall places, eight in number, where
Hades is vsed in Scripture, beeing well
considered, they shewe the same mani-
festlie: also for that the *Seauentie* Inter-
pretours doe vse it so too, and finally be-
cause *Sheol* in Hebrew, whiche all men

Answer.

The Scripture
bath *Hades* in
8. places.

know

now to be the same that the Greeke *Hades* is, signifieth likewise so too.

And firste that we may viewe the sense of all places of Scripture, and so not be deceived: 1. Thus we read *"The gates of Hades shall not prevaile against the Church"*. Hee speaketh heere of persecution and suffering death for the faith of Christ. But sayeth hee, This shall not prevaile against you: What? *Death* and *Destruction* shall not. So that the *gates of Hades* heere are nothing els but the *gates of Death*, the power of Death, shall neuer prevaile, though they assaile you. And this phrase seemes to bee taken from the vie of the Iewes, who executed their seuerer iudgements of life and death in the *gates* of their Cities.

Hence the phrase seemeth to come, *"The gates of Death, for the power of those Rulers whiche should condemne to death the goulie for their faith and a good conscience, and yet not prevaile"*. That wee should translate heere, the *gates of Hell*, meaning directlie *vices*, and *sinnes*, and *crimes*, as some of the ancient Writers doe, the circumstances of the Text doe seeme not to beare it. For by occasion, as seemeth of the "former encouragment to his faithfull and godly ones, he falleth to tell them of his owne sufferings at Ierusalem soone after, where though hee should be betrayed and slayne, yet shoulde hee rise

Mat. 16. 18.

5.

By a Metonymy.

† Except wee ascerne it but as a simple Hebraisme, as Isa. 38. 10. VVhere the gates of Sheol is nothing els but Death, or the power and strength of Death.
cc ver. 21.

son, & not the gates of Hell, † as is about
said. Howbeit if anie will vrge the com-
mon translation, and say *the gates of Hell*, let
him know this interpretation is receiued
among the learned not for the proprietie
of the word *Hades*, but for "a circumstance
of the text heere requiring, it to be so tra-
slated, as they conceaue. And I confesse
that so here it may be, and doe shew that
thus this *Hades* is somertyme vsed: and
namely in the last example following out
of *Luke Chap. 16. 23*. Yet properlie *Hades*
is nothing els but *the Vnseene Worlde of the*
Dead, not *Hell*. 1. Our present place chief-
lie in quzstion is to be noted. * *Thou wilt*
not leaue my soule (in Hades) with the dead, or in
the vnseene worlde of the dead: nor suffer thy holy
one to see corruption. Our common translati-
on hath it, *Thou wilt not leaue my soule in the*
grane, &c. which is not much amisse, consi-
dering the scope of the Apostle and the
maner of phrase both in Hebrue and in
Greeke somertyme, that is by a figure *Synec-*
doche, the whole for the parte: as before I
noted somertyme it may bee. But seeing a
figure heere needs not, the most plaine, &
moste naturall, and familiar translation
shuld be thus, as I haue noted: *Thou wilt*
not leaue my soule amongst the dead, nor suffer
thy holy one to see corruption. 1. That
this is the natural and proper sence of *Ha-*
des, we haue scene enough already by the
authentike Greeke writers. 2. That the

† That is, re-
garding it as it
indeede touch-
eth vs.

is Namely, be-
cause this ma-
lice and rage of
persecutors pro-
ceedeth from
Hell, and is
stirred up by all
the power and
might of Satan

* *Alt. 2. 27.*
taken out of
Tsa. 16. 16.

Seauentie vse it so to, after whose translation & phrase *Peter* heere speaketh: and that the Hebrue word *Sheol* which is originall of this phrase hath the same sense likewise anon hereafter we shall make manifest, God willing. But to translate this *Hell* as some now wil haue it, that is openlie wrong and iniurious to the text. And thus I proue it: First "*David* speaketh it in some sorte as true of + him selfe, being a type and figure of *Christ*, whom in deepe in more speciall wise it concerned. Again *Peter* in this point for the which he citeth this verse of the *Psalme*, *doeth plainlie graunt all this of *David* as well as of *Christ*, sauing that *David* was left therein euen till this day, which *Christ* was not. But this is only the state of death, and the graue whiche *David* is yet left in, not *Hell* in any wise, yea he was neuer in *Hell*. Therefore *Hades* and *Sheol* here can not be for *Hell*. Secondly, if it bee altogether heere from the purpose of *Peter* to speake to the Iewes of *Christes* soule being in *Hell*, then there is no reason to take these wordes *Hades* and *Sheol* heere for *Hell*. But by the " whole text it is euident, *Peter* had no reason nor purpose to speake to these Iewes of *Christes* soule being in *Hell*. His vvhole direct purpose was to shewe them of his soule being amongst the dead, and his body in the graue, like as other men are when they dy,

" *Phil.* 16. 10.

" *Bulling. De*
" *ead.* 1. 7.

" *Act.* 2. 39.

" *Act.* 2.

and

INTO HELL PROPERLY 215

and was from thence mightily rayfed vp
 agayne, more then other men were or
 could bee. Therefore *Hades* and *Sheol*
 heere doe signifie the *state of death*, and
 not *Hell*. The firste *proposition* standeth on
 plaine and manifeste reason, speciallie
 seeing these are the very wordes that hee
 presseth and standeth on, to shew them
 howe Christ beeing *truly dead*, was yet
 risen agayne. And as touching the *assum-
 ption*, that is most apparant, *Peter* had no
 reason in the worlde, and therefore no
 purpose to speake to these Iewes of Chri-
 stes *Soule being in Hell*. 1. They being in-
 credulous and vnbeleeuing. 2. The
 thing beeing inuisible and straunge, and
 vncouth, not subiect to the sense, and
 without all example of the like. 3. Hee
 intending nothing els in all this speech
 to them, but to teache that this IESVS
 whom they had slayne, was not *notre dead*,
 but risen agayne, why should hee nowe
 speake of *Hell*: What reason had hee? If
 Christ had bene in *Hell*, it made not ne-
 cessarilie neither for his *death*, nor *resurrec-
 tion*, whiche was the onely scope of his
 speech (verse 31.) but being an vncouth
 and inuisible thing, it might rather hin-
 der their faith, then further it. There-
 fore verilie *the state of death* is all that
Hades and *Sheol* doe heere signifie: and it
 is the whole and onely purpose of *Peter*
 heere so to testifie.

verse 31.

H s

3. One

116 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

3.
92. 6. 1.

3. One further in a pale horse whose name was death, and Hell followed after him. That is the world of the dead, *Regnum mortuorum*. If you referre it only to our bodies, then it may be the grave. But rather I take it generally for the state of the dead after this life. It can not be Hell certainly: because the text addeth Power was given them to slay with the sword, and with famine, and death, and with wilde beastes: Hell slayeth none in that sort. Again it is said, they had power, on the fourth parte of the world. But to say preciselie that the fourth parte of the world at any time should goe to Hell, I take it to be a strange phrase in the Scripture. In a worde this place is nothing els but a prophesie of great mortalitie that at a certen time should come vpon the world for the contempt of the Gospell, & that they should dye by such meanes as are there specified. Wherein Hell dealeth not, neither sheweth any power. Therefore Hades heere can not be Hell.

4.
Rev. 20. 14.

4. "Death and Hades, (that is the place or world of the dead, or the kingdome and power of death) were cast into Hell. It were absurde to saye, Death and Hell were cast into Hell: and therefore so we saye also in the verse before, Death and the World of the Dead, rendered up their dead to iudgment. 5. "O Death, where is thy victorie? O Hades, where is thy strength? Neither can this be meant of Hells because all his speech heere is of the resurrection from the

5.
1. Cor. 15. 55

the dead, and this very speech is an^a insult
 & triumph, as it were, *Death & swallowed up*
 the power of *Death*: seeing they shall not be
 able to holde them, whom they shall get
 into their power. As for *Hell* that would
 not bee aduersarie to the *resurrection*, but
 would desire it rather, as being greedie of
 the bodies also of the damned which the
 it should haue together with their soules,
 and not before. He speaketh not then of
 the damnation of the wicked, but of the
 Resurrection of the dead. More also, hee
 doeth plainlie allude to that of the Pro-
 phet *† Ose. 13. 14.* *O grave, or O world of the*
dead, I will be thy destruction. Not *in Hell*: for
 the Prophet speaketh to comfort Israell
 in their captiuitie, where though they
 were for their rebellion against God de-
 stroyed grieuonslie a long time, yet at
 length hee promiseth to stave his iudge-
 ments, & *Death* should not deuoure them
 anie more, it should not haue her former
 power vpon Gods people, but they shuld
 liue and florish againe, if they repented.
 And this the Apostle might very fitlie al-
 lude vnto, when he spake of the *resurrec-
 tion*, which might be notably compared to
 Israells returne out of the *† 1. p. 1. of miserie*
 in *Babylons Captiuitie*. But of *Hell* there
 could be no direct nor proper meaning,
 neither in th'one nor th'other. *6. † I haue*
the Keyes of Hades and of Death: That is no
 thing els. but Christ, who was dead, hath

Death is swallowed up in victory.
1 Cor. 15. 54.

† Ose. 13. 14.

† Luc. 24. 7.

6. † Rev. 1. 18.

H ; now

116 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

3.
9 Rev. 6. 8.

3. One *firstborn* in a pale horse whose name was death, and *death* followed after him. That is the world of the dead, *Regnum mortuorum*. If you referre it only to our bodies, then it may be the grave. But rather I take it generally for the state of the dead after this life. It can not be *Hell* certainly: because the text addeth *Power was given them to slay with the sword, and with famine, and death, and with wilde beastes. Hell* slayeth none in that sort. Again it is said, they had *power, on the fourth parte of the world*. But to say preciselie that the fourth parte of the world at any time should goe to *Hell*, I take it to be a strange phrase in the Scripture. In a worde this place is nothing els but a prophesie of great mortalitie that at a certen time should come vpon the world for the contempt of the Gospell, & that they should dye by such meanes as are there specified. Wherein *Hell* dealeth not, neither sheweth any power. Therefore *Hades* heere can not be *Hell*.

4.
11 Rev. 20. 14.

4. "Death and *Hades*, (that is the place or world of the dead, or the kingdome and power of death) were cast into *Hell*. It were absurde to saye, *Death* and *Hell* were cast into *Hell*: and therefore so we saye also in the verse before, *Death* and the *World of the Dead*, rendered by them dead to iudgment. 5. "O *Death*, where is thy victorie? O *Hades*, where is thy strength? Neither can this be meant of *Hells* because al his speech heere is of the resurrection from

5.
1. Cor. 15. 55

the dead, and this very speech is an^e insult^e & triumph, as it were, *Death is swallowed up in victory.* *1 Cor. 15.* seeing they shall not be able to holde them, whom they shall gett into their power. As for *Hell*, that would not bee aduersarie to the resurrection, but would desire it rather, as being greedie of the bodyes also of the damned which the it should haue together with their soules, and not before. He speaketh not then of the damnation of the wicked, but of the Resurrection of the dead. More also, hee doeth plainlie allude to that of the Prophet *† Ose. 13.* *O grave, or O world of the dead, I will be thy destruction.* Not *† Hell*: for the Prophet speaketh to comforte Israell in their captiuitie, where though they were for their rebellion against God destroyed grieuouslie a longe time, yet at length hee promiseth to stave his iudgements, & *Death* should not deuoure them anie more, it should not haue her former power vpon Gods people, but they shuld liue and florish againe, if they repented. And this the Apostle might very fitlie allude vnto, when he spake of the resurrection, which might be notably compared to Israels returne out of the *†* pit of miserie in *Babylons* Captiuitie. But of *Hell* there could be no direct nor proper meaning, neither in th'one nor th'other. *6. † I haue the Keyes of Hades and of Death:* That is nothing els. but Christ, who was dead, hath

H ; now

Death is swallowed up in victory.
1 Cor. 15.

† Ose. 13.

† Lucia Zech.
2. 11.

6.
† Rev. 1. 18.

118 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**

Howe *but came* death, and hath power to do
no more. He hath ouercome death & hol-
 deth the power thereof for him selfe and
 others. For him selfe, in that hee can and
 will dye no more. For others, in that hee
 can give to death whom he will, & whom
 he will he saue. This therefore is a plain
 opposition to his former state when hee
 was in death, but nowe shalbe so *no more*
 and nothing els, as the beginning of the
 verse hanging together with this, doeth
 expresse. *I live, but was dead, and (nowe) be-
 holde I live for ever, and I haue the Keyes of Hades
 and of Death.* As if hee should saye: I am
 henceforth *no more* subiect, but superior
 thereto. There is nothing of Hell.

7.

* Mat. 11. 33.

*v 7. And thus Supernaculum which was lift vp in
 the Fleauum, shalbe brought downe to destruction,
 to Hades. He speaketh heere of the destru-
 ction of the Citie and people thereof,
 which he calleth Hades. And this is mani-
 fest: 1. By the notable Opposition of their
 liuing *lifting vp to the heauen*, and their *bring-
 ing downe to Hades*. In the 1. he meaneth not
 that they were lift vp to eternall blessed-
 nes, but only that they were lift vp in re-
 noue, in pompe, & in flourishing state,
 according as Latins speak also *ad sidera
 tolli*, to be carried into the skye. Wherefore in the
 later he meaneth they shalbe brought downe
 to destruction, to haue *no being* ingloriously:
 that is *Hades* heere in this place, but not
 Hell. 2. This is also manifest in y he saith*

pre-

presētly of Sodom, whervnto here he cōpa-
reth Capernaū, if they had had the meanes
of repētāce in such maner as Capernaū had,
Sodom had remayned to this day. This sheweth
he spake but of Capernaums destruction, & of
her not being on the earth: and not of their
damnation in hell by the word Hades.

8. This remayneth only, *The rich man † in
the state of Death, or in the world of the Dead, li-
† ted up his eyes being in tormentes: Thus I say we
may trāslate it, in the world of the dead, or being
amongst the dead, he li†ed up his eyes, &c. And the
there is no text in all † Bible where Hades
signifieth Hel necessarily. But if we graunt
to say Hell in this place for Hades, yet we af-
firme, this sense is giue it for other circū-
stances, not for † nature of the word. Be-
cause he was such a man, and because it is
straight expressed he was in tormentes being
dead. Therefore to be in Hades, to be in the
the World of the Dead, that was to him in deed
to be in Hell As for Hell in the Scripture it
hath another word Gehenna which proper-
lie signifieth it. As † Iust. Martyr obserueth, † Iust. Mart. 1
he de Gehenna est i topus entha kolaz esthai mellous
ss hois adthōs biōsantes, Gehenna Hell is a place where
the wicked shalbe tormented. Wherby is insinua-
ted that Hades is not properly Hell, which
Gehenna is properly for. And thus Mr Bu-
cer excellently obserueth not only in that
† before cited, but also on Luk, * Dives nō sum-
pliciter scribitur esse en hade, sed † in Gehēnā, quia
in tormentis † flamma. The riche man is not saide
to be simply in Hades, but also in Hell: because he is saide
to be in syry tormentes.

8.

* Luke 16. 23.
† in Hades.

† Iust. Mart. 1
Apol. 2.

† Pag. 101.
* in Luke. 16.
26.

Hades and Ge-
hēna which in
the Scripture is
only for Hell,
are not all one.

Therefore *Hades* and *Gebenna* are not properly all one: and whersoever *Hades* is for *Hell*, there it is taken by a figure *synecdoche* the whole for the parte, the inuisible state of the dead for that where the damned are in torments. Thus then *Hades* in scripture is no where properly for *Hell*.

The Septuagint: the use of *Hades* after the sense of the authentike Greekes.

Which also is further to be declared by the 70. Translatours. Whose wordes and phrases the Apostles themselves vsed and chiefly followed in all their allegationes from the old Testament. So that their vsing of Greeke wordes and phrases must needs bee of greate authority. These put *Hades* generally after the authentike vs

* Iob. 33. 23.

for *Death*, the state of the dead: as * His soule draweth neere to the grave, and he *zōē autou en hade*: his life is amonge the dead, or in the world of the dead. And

† Ps. 94. or after the Greeke 93. ver. 17.

parōtēsē to Hade ho psūke mou. My soule had dwelt in the world of the dead. In Hebrue it is *Dumah* in silence, that is in the estate of death. Againe

** Psal. 111. or 113. ver. 17.

* *auk ho nekros amēfousē se, oude ho pantes katēbasantes eis Haden*. The dead praise thee not, o Lord, nor any that goe downe to the state of the dead. Here also in Hebrue it is *dumah* to the place of silence. Further ** what man liueth, and shall not see death, *rusētai ten psūchem autou ek chiros Haden?*

* Psal. 89. 49.

shall he deliuer his Soule from the power of the Vnsence world, that is from death? And * My soule was

* psal. 78. 3.

filled with sorrowes, *kai ho zōē mou sē Hade enisēn*.

{ Iob. 17. 13.

And my life drew neere vnto the Dead, or to the worlde of the Dead. And Iob saith, † *Hades mou ho oikos*:

The World of the Dead shalbe my habitation. In all these places and in many other such like

of

of the 70. *Hades* can not be *hell*: but the
state or world of the dead. Finallie consider
the Hebrue word *Sheol*: Al men will graue
that *Sheol* in Hebrue and *Hades* in Greeke,
as here they are vsed for the same thing,
so in deed euery where els they are *all one*.
That is out of question. But it is manifest
in the Scripture that *Sheol* is generally v-
sed for the state of the death, the worlds of the
dead, and speciallie sometime for the soule,
sometime for the body, sometime for the
good, sometime for the bad, according as
the circumstances doe imply: but alwayes
for their state in death, and no further pro-
perlie. And because it commeth of *Shaal*, to
crave or aske, it signifieth that this *World* or
state of the dead, though it takes infinite, yet
it is still taketh, and is neuer satisfied. Nei-
ther ought any man to doubt that *Sheol*
hath this familiar, ordinarie, and natural
signification, to note as I saide generallie
the state of death. There are innumerable
places of Scripture that doe euince it, and
chiefie that it is not properlie Hell. Firste
that where Iacob sayeth of Ioseph whom
he thought to be dead, "*Ered el bens Abel*
Sheolab, I will goe downe mourning vnto my sonne to
the place of the dead. Questionles hee meant
not into Hell, but into the place of the dead
that were dead in the Lorde. Also Ezechia
thought he should haue gone to *besbagnare*
Sheol, to the gates of death. He thought not that
he should haue gone to Hell, but to the
state

The Hebrue
Sheol signifi-
eth the estate
of death, or the
World of death
likewise, as
hath bene shewd
in *Hades*.
* Ps. 138. 10.

Shaal, to
crave or aske
it signifieth that
this *World* or
state of the dead,
though it takes
infinite, yet it
is still taketh,
and is neuer
satisfied. Nei-
ther ought any
man to doubt
that *Sheol* hath
this familiar,
ordinarie, and
natural signifi-
cation, to note
as I saide gener-
allie the state
of death. There
are innumera-
ble places of
Scripture that
doe euince it,
and chiefie that
it is not proper-
lie Hell. Firste
that where Iacob
sayeth of Ioseph
whom he thought
to be dead, "*Ered
el bens Abel Sheolab*,
I will goe downe
mourning vnto
my sonne to the
place of the dead.
Questionles hee
meant not into
Hell, but into the
place of the dead
that were dead
in the Lorde. Also
Ezechia thought
he should haue
gone to *besbagna-
re Sheol*, to the
gates of death.
He thought not
that he should
haue gone to Hell,
but to the state

Sheol not for
Hell properly,
but for the ge-
nerall estate of
Death.
* Gen. 37. 35.

* Isa. 38. 10.

* Eccl. 12.

† Ecclesiastes

9. 10.

* Eccl. 3.

* Job 14. 13.

* Chap. 17.

13.

* Eccl. 16.

* Eccl. 16. in the
Dare to the
grave.

† Hose 13. 14.

* Eccl. 17.

* Hose 13. 14.

† Hose 13. 14.

* Hose 13. 14.

* 1. Cor. 13.

35.

† Psal. 89. 49.

and 88. 4. and

18. 6. and 16.

10. &c.

* Job 30. 23.

† He meaneth
Sheol.

State of Death. And * *Lo sheol todbecha*, The world of the Dead doeth not confesse thee, Death can not pray thee, They that goe downe to the pitt can not hope for truth. All this is meant not of the damned in *Hell*, but of them in the *state of death*. So † *Bisheol* is in the *World of the dead*, or in the *state of Death*: which the coherēce doth proue, which is betwene * *hammer him the dead*, and this here. Againe, * *O that thou wouldst bid me in the World of the dead, bisheol*: Job would not desire to be in *Hell*: and he sayeth, the like shall come to him selfe * *Sheol berhi* my house shalbe the place of the dead: and all my hopes of recouery in this world, shall goe downe with me † *badde sheol* to the * strong place of the world of the Dead. Howbeit Job was not so faithlesse as to thinke he should goe to *Hell*. Again † I will redeeme them *myad Sheol*, from the power of Death: *Sheol* o Death, or o kingdome of Death I will bee thy destruction. This hath bin shewed * before to be spokē directly & pperly of the state of Death, or y power of Death, not of *Hell*. Which the olde Latin trāslator doth also wel * obserue, who turneth it *ā Morte. frō Death*: again * both *inferni* & * *ō Mors*, that is, o Death. Further let it be noted y in *David*, whose phrasewe are now a skāning of, ther is no word almost more cōmon then † *Sheol* in this sense: and specially there it is seene, where he expresse referreth it to the Soule. The same also * Job meaneth, where he speaketh of † *Beth mogued lecal chas*, the House appointed for al the living. Thus therefore it is manifest that *Sheol* in Hebrue is not properly *Hell*, but it is the

World of the Dead, or the state of Death simply and indifferently. Whiche sense the *Sentence* doe plainlie confirme also: who sometime translate *Sheol*, Death: * *Misbeol* * Prov. 23. 24
ek thanaton from Death, not from Hell, and somtime where they turne *Sheol* *Hades*, yet it is moſte euident and vndenyable that very Death, or the eſtate of Death, or the power of Death is there meant: as in all thoſe places wherein we ſpake of *Sheol* immediately before. Therefore the 70. vnderſtand *ſheol* and *hades* alſo for the ſtate of death ſimply & generally, not for Hell properly. Euen altogether after y natural propertie of the word with the authetike Grecians, as reaſon is that they ſhould. Thus there is no queſtion then, but *hades* & *ſheol* being all one, & namely with the 70. who do almoſt alwayes uſe y one for the other, that therefore *Hades* & *Sheol* both do not ſignifie Hell properly, but the ſtate of Death, the World or place of the dead, ſuch as are gon out of this viſible World into another. Alſo where *hades* and *ſheol* are more ſpecially taken for y, † *Grave* or the ſtate of dead Bodies, euen heere in effect it is all one as before, they ſignifie the ſtate of Death: it is not poſſible y they ſhould be for Hell properly & primarily in any of theſe and infinite more ſuch like places. Which beſides all the former, * *M. Bucer* ſheweth excellently: *Sheol* *Hades* & *Infernum* in Scripture do alwayes ſignifie the *Grave*, & ſo the ſtate of y Dead whatſoeuer it bee either happy or curſed. And * *Tremell.* This Hebrue word *Sheol* doth ſignifie any ſtation or ſtate of the dead in generall: and Hell it may ſometime ſignifie but by a figure ſynecdoche.

Note.

† Gen. 42. 38.
 1. King. 2. 9.
 Iſa. 14. 10. compared with 11
 Eze. 32. 21. 27
 Ion. 2. 2. &c.
 * *Omnino ſheol id quod Graeci ton Hades, Latini infernum vocant, ſolent in Scripturis ſepulchrum atque inde ſtatum mortuorum ſignificat qualicumque ſit vel ſalix vel inferlix. In Luk. 16. 26.*
 * *Sheol vox Hebraea ſtatum quem quilibet mortuorum in uniuerſum vocat. In Pſal. 49. 15.*

Now

124 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

Now then seeing the authentike *Grecians* do vse *Hades* for the *inuisible World* after this life, that is for the *World of the dead*, yea *Inferi* in Latine is taken so to as wee haue scene, and seeing the new Testament hath *Hades* sundry times in like sence, and the 70. interpreters before them, & seeing the Hebrue *Sheol* whiche they make to be and is indeed al one with *Hades*, may and doth signifie also the *vnscene worlde*, that is the *World of the dead generally*. Therefore it followeth that in our Creed also *Hades* is lyable to this sence, and for the force of the worde there is no cause to translate it *Hell*, and the Fathers by meere mistaking the proper & true vse of this worde haue fancied such diuers and vaine thinges, which foolish children haue since amplified, of Christs going downe to *Hell* in his Soule after death, as neither themselues knewe, neither can they declare to others.

• Which is so infinitely wide and large, that it is neuer full.

Objection.

Answer.

as *Ps. 136. 10.*
Alt. 2. 27. and
in other places.

The English
word *Hell* is
not good in
the Creed.

But now it will be objected, how then should wee translate the Hebrue and the Greeke *Sheol* & *Hades*, to fit those words in our language. It is true indeede, through the scarcitie of our tounge it is most hard to fitte a translation in English to those words of Scripture. But this is euident, that which is commonly vsed & namely in our vulgare Creedes, *Hell*, is a word to partiall, to vnfit, yea corrupt, and starke nought. It is suteable to the largenes of the Hebrue and Greeke meaning, though not

not so iuste with the Nature of our worde, to say in English, *the Dead*. As in the Creede,† *He went vnto the Dead: or, Hee descended among the Dead*. Also “*Then wilt not leaue my soule with the Dead, nor thy bodye one to see corruption*. Which as I haue shewed before, is the true, plaine, easie, familiar, and common sense of *Hades* among the authentike Greekes: as also of *Sheol* in Hebrue.

But to translate thus, is to depart from the Fathers sense of *Hades*: they vse it alwayes or most commonly for *Hell*. They vse it indeed commonly, eyther for *Hell* it selfe, or for a place of darkenesse, a parte of *Hell*, far from the place of *Blessednesse*. And yet they graunt also, that it may bee (yea and *Infers* to) vsed for *Abrahamus bosom*, where *Lazarus had soj*, and where was a great distance & contrariety betweene *Hell* and it. What may this be, but the place of *blessednes*, I thinke, euen in their iudgements? How soeuer it be, we stand not vpon the Fathers language to translate the Scriptures, or this Article of our Creede. The Apostles and Apostolike men as also the Sepruagint to, did write and speake as the authentike Grecians did, as they learned to speake of the Maisters of that rounge, and as the people then might best vnderstand, not making phrases, nor fitting their wordes to the latter writers that spake and wrote long since them. Therefore according to the authentike vse

† Or if you will, say thus: Hee went into the vnscene world &c.
“ *Act. 2. 27.*
Psa. 16. 10.

Obiection.

Answer.

126 *THAT CHRIST WENT NOT*
vise of *Hades*, so ought we indeede to trans-
late this both in Englishe and Latine:
Descendit ad mortuos, He descended among the Dead.

Objection.

Why, in effect this is nothing els but
to Dye: and that was expressed of Christ
before, *he was Dead, Buried, &c.* But in this
short summe of Religion to repeate one
point twise were needles, and against the
nature of a shORTE summe. And to vse a
darke and hard phrase after a plaine and
easie, is vnreasonable & absurd. It is true,
I hold it vnreasonable altogether in the
short and vulgar Creede appointed euen
for the common Christians, to vse words
darke and difficulte. And when the same
thing is by diuers wordes expressed, the
later ought to bee the lighter and cleer-
er, for to open the meaning the better
which in the former is not so euident.
Therefore I fully graunte in the Creede
speciallie, the phrase must bee familiar,
tritiuall, easie, and plaine. Which heere
in this taking of *Hades* is so: it is moſte

* Not if it bee
taken for Hell,
for so it is take
but sometime.
It is very easie
and familiar if
wee take it ge-
nerally for the
world of the
Dead.

† By many good
authors. pag.
77. &c.

easie (I saye) and * plaine to euery Gre-
cian, and moſte naturall and proper in it
selfe, as I haue sufficiently shewed † be-
fore. For we must remember our Creed
was not written in *Englishe*, and there-
fore our abusive worde *Hell* ought not to
trouble vs. But lookewee to the Greeke
Hades wherein it was written, and to the
Hebrue *Sheol* wherevnto also the Greeke
fitteth

stteth : and them it is as cleere as the Sonne at noone day, that *katabénai eis Hades* and *redeth Sheolih* are the common and familiar phrases to goe to the Worlde of the Dead, or among the Dead. As for the repeating of the same thing, it is not idle nor vnsignificant, but moſte *Emphaticall*.

For euen presentlie after the Apostles there arose Hæretikes * denyinge that Christ was a true Man but only in shew, and therefore also suffered and dyed but in shewe and appearance onely. Such also continued a long tyme, and such are at this daye. Now to establishe all Christians against such diuelish opinions, the Primitiue Church added heere diuers effectuell wordes, it seemeth. Whereas els it had bene enough to haue saide, *Hee suffered vnder Pontius Pilate*: But to expresse and the signifie this pointe of Christian faith euen for the simple more fullie, there is added further, firste *Hee was Crucified*: and yet further, *Hee was Dead*; yea more, *He was Buried*; and finally to speake to the full, *Hee went to the Worlde of the Dead, or among the Dead*. And this laste verelie is meant of the Soule of Christ, to shewe what it did, being nowe parted from the body: as the other wordes before are touching the visible parte his *Bodye, Crucified, Dead, and Buried*. Which Bucer sawe verie well, * *Ex eo quod confitemur Dominum descendisse ad inferna intelligendum est, Dominum Spi-*

The Hebrew and Greeke phrases beere in all one. Redeth Sheolih: Katabénai eis Haden.

* *Ignat. ad. Trall.*

Note

* *Buc. in Math. 27.50.*

visu suo ita se immixisse spiritibus mortuorum scilicet eternum, ut corpore immixtus fuit illorum corporibus per sepulturam. In that we beleene that the Lorde went vnto the Dead, we vnderstande that in his Soule he ioyned to the societie of the Soules of the dead Saintes, eue as in his body he was ioyned to their bodies by Buriall. So that all these wordes in the Creed haue a very profitable vse and stronge *Emphasis* for to shewe that Christ truely *Dyed* in deed, and had euery way the verie same conditron as other mē had as touching Humane nature, that so all Christians might bee the better established against those Hæresies denying the same, as is aforesaid. If any say, but in this short summe there should be no repetitions at all. I haue shewed, that this *his going among the Dead*, or *vnto the dead*, or *into the Vnseene World*, is most filie to bee referred to the Soule of Christ parting from his body, shewing whither it went, euen whither all other Good mens Soules went, *to the place appointed for the Saintes*: thither went Christes soule too, like other mens, being parted from his body: *eis Hadou*. Whereof if any doe aske particularlie, Whither is this? I aunswere, namely into *theaue*: For whither should the Saintes goe els? And thus it is *no repetition* of anie thing that particularlie went before. Howbeit in the Creed there are indeede *repetitions*, as short a summe as it is, and yet not vnprofitable. As thus, hauing saide, *He suffered*, it is added, *Crucified*, and after that *Dead*, yea *Buried* is but an addition

¶ Which is the
griue Gramma-
ticall sense of
this word, viz.
with respect
had to the
qualitie of
Christes per-
son.

tion also to signifie that he was *truly dead*. Therefore it is possible that there might be *repetitions* profitable in the Creede, and namely when they be specially emphaticall. But further you will say, this word *He descended to the Dead*, doeth shewe, it seemeth, that the place was *downward*, whither he went, and not *upward* to Heauen. I aunswere, That is nothing: So Iacob * spake *Ered el beni Abel Sheolab*: I shall goe downe mourning to my Sonne among the Dead. Yet Iacob thought not to goe to *Hell* to his Sonne, but among the soules of the godly dead, that is to say *into Heauen*, where he knewe he should be after death, & his Sonne he doubted not (being dead as he thought) was there already. So then this worde *Descending* or *Going downe*, is nothing els in this matter, but a "*decaying, a falling downe, or a coming to an ende in this life*: because they that liue and flourish heere, are said to *arise*, and *stande vp*, and *spring vp*. Only this further emphasis seemeth to be in it: *Katechism* may import that He came vnder the power and dominiõ, as it were, of Death, although but for a while: for he † could not be held thereof. Which is it, I thinke, that * *Olenian* vnderstandeth in this place. Wherefore this phrase in the Creede, agreeeth with † Hebrue very fitly, whẽce it seemeth also to be takẽ. And thus mē may see, it is euery way a most easie, a familiar, and vsuall phrase, not with the Greeks

I only

Objection

Answer

* Gen. 37. 35.

† It seemeth not that the *Græke* properly can be here meant: seeing Iacob hoped not to be together with his Sonne as touching the bodye.

* *Bulling*. Dec. 1. 7.

† *AE. 1. 24.*

* *Olenian* is Symbol.

130 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**
only, but in proportō with the Hebrews
also, I say even that in the Creede *catches*
in Hadou to signifie *Hee went vnto the Dead*,
which we in English too corruptly vie to
say, *He went into Hell*: when as indeed heere
concerning Christ, it was into Heauen.

Obiection.

Lastly it may be you will say, if Christs
Soule after his death went immediatly
into Heauen, then he Ascended twise in-
to Heauen: once before his resurrection,
and againe 40. dayes after it. In the
Creede also then there are two articles
touching this one matter of his *Ascension*.
But this seemeth very vnttrue: specially
seeing himself. saith after his rising from
death, *I have not yet ascended*. Therefore
immediatly after death hee went not into

7 Ioh. 20. 17.

Heauen: and if not to Heauen, then to Hell.
Answer. I answer, notwithstanding all this, his
soule might and did immediatly goe to
Heauen. And what if in this wise he *Ascen-*
ded twise? what reason is against it? That
is, once in his Soule alone: in the time of
his death, as the soules of all the Godly
besides doe: and once againe afterward
when both Soule & Body together as-
cended, even as we also shall heereafter.
Of this his later perfite intyre and appa-

2 Ioh. 20. 17.

rant Ascension, he saith, *I have not yet As-*
cended. Whereby he denyeth not his other
maner of ascending, that is in his soule

11 Act. 2. 34.

only. Euen as "Peter denyeth that David is
yet ascended. Hee meaneth as touching his
body

body and all: for his soule was then, and long before that (no doubt) ascended into Heaven. And thus in our Creed there may well be 2. articles, for 2. so diuers and distinct kindes of Christs going to Heaven.

Hitherto we haue waded in our firste point, about the opening of the word of this Article of the Creede, *he descended to Hades*. Wherein it is as cleere as the light at noone, that the natural, simple, proper, and true meaning therof may be, *He went into the Dead*. Now followeth our tsecond

† See pag. 93.

generall point, to proue that this is the very meaning therof, and nothing els indeede. Which thus I conclude.
If this Article meane not that Christ went to Limbus, nor went into the Grane, nor his Hellish sufferings on the Crosse, nor afterward locally in Hell, nor any going down locally into Hell at all: then heere is certainly meant that his soule separat from his body did go, as other mens do, into the World of the Dead, or among the dead, and nothing els.

But all those former opinions are vnttrue heere, and not meant in the Creede.

Therefore this our last rehearsed is true, & is there in the Creed truly & plainly intended, & meant.

1. Christ went not to any Limbus, seing y faithful before Christs time, had the same benefit of grace in effect which wee since haue had. Because Christ was the same yesterday, & the same to day, & the same for euer: and Faith, w they had as well as we, was the euidence of things not scene, and

I.
No Limbus signified in our Creede.

132 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**
the ground of things hoped for: and Abraham saw the day of Christ, and rejoyced: and the Fathers before did eate the same spirituall meate, & dranke the same spirituall drink which we doe: and Christ was the Sacrifice of redemption slaine before the beginning of the world. Therefore by the vertue and efficacie of Christes death, Heauen was opened to them before his Incarnation, as well as vnto vs since. And therefore there was no *Limbo*, neyther could Christ goe to anie such place. 2. This Article can not be meant of the *Graue*, because that was most plainlie and familiarlie noted before in these wordes, *He was buried*: which to repeate againe in a darker & more doubtfull word as *Hades* is, without difference added, can not be likely. For *Hades*, as I said, is referred generallie to the state of the Dead: that is, to the *Soules* as well as to the *Bodies* of the dead. 3. Heere are not meant Christes *Hellish* sorrowes and sufferings, which in deed he on the *Crosse* indured, as wee haue shewed in the former quæstio. Although *Maister Calum* thus thought, yet surely this Article soemeth to meane another thing: * (*quod pater tanti Viri dixerim*) because 1. the word *Hades* signifieth not *Hell* peculiarly, as I haue shewed, but whē & place doth necessarily* require it. 2. If it were so, it must be here by a *Figure* not altogether so familiar, namely a *Metaphoricall* speech, which hard.

2.
The Graue properly not meant by going to Hades in y^e Creed.

3.
Christes Hellish sorrowes which he suffered, not meant by his going to Hades.

* *Sauing the reverence of so worthy a man.*

* *As this place in the Creeds doth not.*

hardly may be admitted into this vulgar and familiar Creed. And generally it vvas meant and comprised in those former wordes, *He suffered vnder Pontius Pilas. Last-ly*, it ought not then to followe after so manie Articles put in betweene, as *Crucified, Dead, Buried.* 4. This Article meaneth not anie sufferings of Christ locally in Hell after his death on the Crosse, as *Il-lerious* thought: because $\frac{1}{2}$ Scripture saith, *by the blood of his Crosse* hee reconciled all things in heauen and in earth, and through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, and *on his Crosse* he razed out all things that were against vs, and spoyled Principalities and powers, and triumphed openlie ouer them, and *on the Crosse* he cryed, *It is finished.* All this sheweth that *on the Crosse* was the last act and finall accomplishment of all his sufferings. Therefore he suffered nothing after his death.

The last errour that heere I am to confute, is this, (which nowe chieftie I bende against) that which chieftie troubleth the Churches in England at this day, by reason that some men, I knowe not whom, haue thought so. It is this, *That Christ after his death went downe into Hell*, not to suffer, but he went to triumph, or to insult ouer the damned reprobate, or what to doe, it is not well knowen, nor yet determined. Nowe we affirme, this also is a meere fiction, and as false as the rest. And that by

4.
Christes going to Hades in the Creed, signifieth not any suffering locally in Hell after his death.

5.
Lastly, Christ went not locally into the vnerie Hell of the damned at any time, nor on any occasion.

134 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT diuers reasons.

A generall argu-
ment by Christ
went not into
Hell.

Allegations
against vt.

First, If no Scripture proue it, then God forbid
we should put this opinion among the Articles of our
faith. But no Scripture proueth it: Therefore it
ought in no wise to be beleened of vs.

They alleadge for the Denyall of the As-
sumption chieflie foure textes of Scripture.
But none to any purpose at all, as easilie
we may see. First, * *Thou wilt not leaue my*
Soule in Hell, (saye they) but falslie and in-
iuriously to the text, as * before we haue
declared. Our common translation hath,
Thou wilt not leaue my Soule in the
Grave: which is not much amisse, consi-
dering the scope of the Apostle there, and
the manner of Scripture-phrasse some-
time. But the most playne, the most na-
turall, and familiar translation should be
this (as also † I haue plainly noted be-
fore) *Thou wilt not leaue my Soule among the*
Dead, nor thy Holy one to see corruption. This
is certaine, it can not bee meant of Hell,
as also I haue proued * before suffici-
entlie. Thus therefore their firste and
chiefest place doeth saye nothing at all
for them.

1.
* Acts 2. 27.
and Psal. 16.
10.
* Pag. 113.

† Pag. 116.

* Pag. 114.

2.
* 1. Pet. 3. 18,
19, 20.

Their second is: * Christ suffering for
vs was *thanatōtheis men sarkis zōopoietheis de*
Pneumati, en hō has tois en phylakē pneumati
poreutheis ekeryxen Apenthesai poio. hōse hapax
exedēcheto he tou Theou makrothumia en hemē-
rais Nōi: Don to Death in the Flesh, but made alive
by the Spirit, wherein hee went (or, had gone) and
prea-

preached to the spirits in prison Having bene (or, which) were disobedient in tyme, past when once the longe suffering of God did wayte in the dayes of Noe. This place is as playne as may be cleane to an other purpose: that is *Christ in his Passion dyed as touching his Manhood, but was raysed to life again by his Divine Spirit, in which in the dayes of Noe he went and preached to those who were nowe (in Peters tyme) damned soules in Hell, and had bene in tyme past (in Noes tyme) disobedient, when as the long suffering of G O D wayted for their repentance but all in vayne.* Thus heere is no one word of his *Soules* going after death to the *soules* in Hell, and of his *then* preaching to them: as some would fro hence willinglie gather. First I will proue our former translatiō & sense to be true: then, I will confute such of their chieftest reasons as they vse to make fīd this place for them selues. And first, If to *Pneumatis* by *ŷ Spirit* be here the *Di-
vine Spirit, the Godhead* of Christ and not his *Humane Soule*, the our translation & sense is true, & theirs false. But here to *Pneumatis* signifieth by the *Divine Spirit*, that is by the *Godhead* of Christ, and not by his *Humane Soule*. Therefore our translation & sense is true, & theirs is false. The *assumptiō* only is here doubted of. But it hath many most certain proofs. First, it is most familiar & common in Scripture by *Flesh* to vnderstand *ŷ whole & Humane nature*, & by *Spirit* the ** Divine nature*. But where both are metioned together oppositely, there they always & euer-

The true sense of Peter in this place.

Reasons for iustificyng our interpretation of Peter in this place.

† 1. Ioh. 4. 2.
Ioh. 1. 14.
Heb. 5. 7. &
2. 14. & 1. Pet.
4. 1.
* Rcu. 2. 7. & 6.
Actes 16. 7.

* Rom. 1. 3. 4.

1 Tim. 3. 16.

† Gal. 5. 17.

Rom. 8. 1.

** 2. Cor. 13. 4

more signifie so in *Christ, and in † other men *Flesh* alwayes signifieth the corrupt nature wholly, the *Spirit*, all the regenerate parte in them. I say, these wordes *Flesh* and *Spirit* mentioned thus together oppositely, do neuer in Scripture signifie the *Body* and *Soule* of a man. Therefore in this place also agreeably to the perpetuall vse of the Scripture besides, these wordes *Flesh* and *Spirit* ought to signifie the *Humane* and the *Diuine* natures of Christ, not the 2. partes of his *Humanitie*, his *Soule* and his *Body*: specially seeing no Circumstance heere overthroweth this sense, as both before, and likewise presentlie after we shall further see. Againe, the very same thing is spoken by ** *Paul*, but more expresse: *Hee was crucified touching his infirmities, but liueth by the power of God.* A place most excellent to be compared with this heere in *Peter*, That which *Peter* calleth *Flesh*, *Paul* calleth *infirmities*, and that whiche *Peter* called *Spirit*, *Paul* calleth the *power of God*. That is, the one signifieth his whole *humanitie*, both bodye and *Soule*, the other his verie *Deitie*. And so by comparing these two most like textes, our sense is cleerly iustified. Thirdlie, if *Spirit* heere signifie his humane *Soule*, then of necessitie you must say, Hee was made aliue in his *Soule*, or by his *Soule*: *2. opoietur ei a pneumatici.* But both these are wicked and false to say: First, not in his *Soule*, for then his soule was once dead or mor-

all at least, because the word is *separat*.
 2. He was made aliue in his Soule, beeing
 don to death in his body. 1. Neither can
 it be by his Soule, for then he liued againe
 by the power of his Soule, and not of God, whi-
 che is absurd and contrarie to many Scri-
 ptures before noted. Therefore *Spirit* here
 must needes be the *Godhead* & Diuine po-
 wer of Christ, by the which he was in dee-
 made aliue after his death in his *Manhood*.
 4. If these wordes *Flesh* and *Spirit* doe signi-
 fic heere in Christ his *Body* and *Soule*, then
 they can not beare any sense but such as
 agreeth with all other men when they
 dye: to be dead in their bodies, but to liue
 in their soules. But this text in these
 wordes sheweth surelye some singular
 thing happening to Christ, wherein hee
 differed from other men: as who so view-
 eth the place, may easilie see. Therefore
 these words here do not signifie in Christ
 his body and soule, but his *Manhood* and
Godhead. 5. All *preaching* is to amende the
 hearers, or to take away from them all ex-
 cuse. This is the very nature and perpe-
 tuall vse of *Preaching*. But thus hee coulde
 not *preach to the Spirit in Hell*. On the earth
 he could by his eternal *Spirit* in the mouth of
 Noe to those liuing then in those dayes,
 though careles and disobedient. There-
 fore this *preaching* is heere meant to haue
 bene on earth in those former tymes, and
 not then in *Hell*. And so consequently in his

Diuine

*That Christ
should be said
being dead, to
goe and preach
torment and con-
fusion to the
Damned of
Noes time now
in Hell, not
mentioning any
other of them
beside, is absurd
& vaine.*

Divine Spirit, & not in his Humane Soule. 6. It
it be absurd to saye, He preached to the
damned in *Hell* who lived in Noes time,
more then to the other damned: and if
there be good reason to saye this of his
preaching on earth in Noahs time, then
this is meant of his Divine Spirite prea-
ching then in the mouth of Noe, and not
of his humane soule preaching after his
death in *Hell*. But it is absurd to say, Hee
preached in *Hell* to those of Noes tyme,
more thē to the other damned there. And
if you aske what reason there is to men-
tion his preaching on earth to them of
Noes time more then to all other disobe-
dient before & since. I answer, it meaneth
not but *Christ* preached by his diuine
spirit to all the rest likewise, eue frō *Adam*
to *Iohn Baptist*: but this speciall instance is
fitly named, as being one of the most sin-
gular tymes of convicting the prophane
rebellious worlde. Nowe this reason can
not be yeilded for his preaching to thē in
Hell which were of Noes time, more thē to
the rest: as all men of any reason doe see.
Therefore this place is meant of *Christs*
Divine Spirit, not of his *Humane Soule*.

Phil. 2.7,8,9.

Nowe cōtrariwise for their reasons that
this is meant of *Christs Soule preaching in Hel*,
the most & the best that I finde are in *Mr*
Hill, noted & confuted by *Mr Humes* verie
effectually. I wil now touch but 2. of thē:
because if I should deale further, I might
seeme

seeme to do; which he hath don already.

First thus they say, No *Pasius* can agree to the *Deitie*. But *made to live* is heere a *Pasius*. Therefore it can not be that the *Deitie* is here the *Spirit*, in which he is said to be made alive. We saye not, He was made alive *in* y^e spirit, but *by* the spirit, & so ought it to be translated. Therefore this *Pasius* is attributed to the *Deitie*, but is the effect not of Christes *Deitie* in his Manhood.

Obiection.

Answer.

An other obiection is, that *pote* in time past doth distinguishe *aposthesi* to the disobedient with which it goeth, frō *parenthesis* *ekeryxen* he had gon and preached. Which is most vntrue: for though *pote* follow *aposthesi*, yet it is so euident and vndenyable that this Aduerbe *pote* may haue reference (and by all reason it must) to this whole clause *parenthesis* *ekeryxen* *aposthesi* *pote*, and so distinguisheth all this from all y^e clause next before *sois en phylake* *pneumasi* (where vnderstand *pasi*) and that is, *so the Spirits that are in prison*. And so *pote* plainly distinguisheth *aposthesi* frō *sois en phylake* (*pasi*) but not frō *ekeryxen*. As Mr. *Bor* heereon doth well declare.

Obiection.

Answer.

The other reasons, though 9. or 10. in number, are not worth the naming: yet whatsoever force is in them, Mr. *Hamet* hath so defeated it, that I will sursease to speake any more thereof. But thus it remayneth that this place of Peter is nothing at all for them, who moste erroneously thinke that *Christ in his Soule went downe after death, and preached in Hell*.

140 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

† Eph. 4.9.

Nowe the third Scripture is, † *Christ is that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first into the lowest partes of the earth?* Heere first note the true meaning, and then the mistaking of this place. I say then these words are a reason takē frō Christs *Ascending* into Heauen to proue his *Descending* from Heauen first. As if he should say, in asmuch as wee see Christ our Lordes *Ascending* vp into Heauē, it followeth that he the very same Lord Descended thence firste: that wee may learne by him howe *humiliation* goeth before *glory*, and *submission* before *exaltation*. Nowe this beeing all, as indeed it is in this place, there is no need to take this *Descending* of any locall going downe into Hell. But you will say, whether doe the words close following *et descendit in terra*, to the lower partes of the earth, adde any thinge in the sense further, or no? And if they doe adde more in the sense, how far do they signifie? I answer, I see not but they may be taken most fitlie to *adde* something in the sense of that sentence before of his *Descending*, and yet nothing for his going to *Hell*. Even this (as I take it) to shewe more particularly howe base a *Descending* and coming into the world Christ had, in humbling himselfe euen to the *Grave*. And so it may bee very like that other place of

Phil. 2.7,8.9.

this Apostle: *He made himselfe of no reputation, and tooke on him the forme of a servant and was made*

INTO HELL PROPERLY. 141

made like unto men, and was found in shape as a man. He humbled himselfe and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Crosse. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, &c. Thus I say in both these places this degree of the baseness of Christs humiliation is notable expressed: heere in the Philip. in that hee humbled himselfe unto death, and before in the Ephes. in that hee descended even to the Grave, that is to say also unto Death.

But some will say, the Grave is not in the lower partes of the Earth, but alwayes a little vnder the earth, that is in $\frac{1}{2}$ higher part of it. Rather Hell may be thought to be in the $\frac{1}{2}$ midst of $\frac{1}{2}$ earth. I answer: *Ta katotera mero* $\frac{1}{2}$ *sés gés*, the lower partes of the earth, seems to me a very plaine *Hebraisme*, expressing *Tachsjosh* $\frac{1}{2}$ *ovets*: which wordes are no where found for Hell, for the Grave they are found: also where in a similitude wth the Grave (not with Hell) a "womans wombe is called *tachsjosh* $\frac{1}{2}$ *ovets*. Like to this also is $\frac{1}{2}$ *ovets tachsjosh* the Earth beneath. Now albeit Maister Hill auoucheth eagerlie that these places are for Hell, yet the very seuerall circumstances in them doe plainly teach that the Grave only is there meant, and the condition of Death: as $\frac{1}{2}$ *Mt. Humes* doeth plainly declare against him. If a man aske, how the Grave may be called the lower part of the earth I answer, it may very well, and is in comparison of this Earth where wee liue, which is the "higher parts of the earth: the oppo-

Objection.

Answer.

* As Mat. 12. 40.

† Psal. 63. 9.

"Psal. 119. 15
"Ezech. 31. 14
16, 18.

† Sect. 9.

" Whence the
living are cal-
led Superstition
and sometimes
Superi: the
Dead some-
time Inferi.

142 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

oppositiō thus stāding betwene y Living
& the Dead & betwene their *proper habita-*
tions, nor betwene the *Living* & *Hell*. The
same sēse manifestly hath another Hebru
phrase very like to this: * *Sheol tachtijah* or
tachah, where thogh many think *Hel* is sig-
nified, yet surely y circumstances do con-
vince that the Graue only is there meant,
the *Grave beneath*: as Mr. *Fulke* against *Gr.*
Martin doth cleerlie proue. Which also we
shall further declare & make manifest by
y phrase "in the heart of the earth, as we shall
see presently in the answer to the next
Scripture objected afterward. But if any
yet say touching tthis, y heere is opposed
Christ's *lowest* debasing to his *highest* ascen-
ding. Now *Hell* is the lowest debasing of
Christ, not y *Grave*. Therefore *Hell* is heere
vnderstoode, & not the *Grave*. Surely thus
by this reason it must follow y Christ not
only was in *Hell*, but y he *suffered also in Hell*.
For indeed it was a far greater humiliariō
of Christ to suffer the paines of *Hel* (which
we have proued before that he might &
* did suffer indeed) thē to be locally in *Hell*
with triumph without suffering. But it is
most false & injurious to Christes death
to say, he *suffered in the lower parts of the Earth*,
taking the same for *Hell*. Therefore his de-
basemēt here we take in the estimatiō of
the world, y is so far as they might sensi-
bly conceiue of his miserable & base cōdi-
tion. Now that could be no lower thē the
Grave. As for *Hel*, both his going thither, &
his suffering of it, whether in y very place,

* *Phil.* 86. 13.
Heb. 14. 10.

* *Mat.* 12. 40

† *Eph.* 4. 9. 10

* Not after his
death, but be-
fore his death.

or out of the place, all this was insensible to the world, & not coming within their estimation: & so not heere spoken of nor intended, where only the *apparent basenes* of Christ is compared with the *apparent going up* of Christ above the sensible Heavens. Thus do I iudge that the descending of Christ *to the lower parts of the earth* may be taken truly, plainly, and as is agreeable to the Hebrue phrase whence surely this Greek phrase ariseth, namely for Christs humiliation euen vnto the *Grave*, that is to becom *vnder the power of Death*. Howbeit some do thinke, it may be takē as direct-
 lie alluding to that † *metaphoricall* Hebrue † *Psal. 139. 19*
 phrase *tachtioth erets*, the lower partes of the earth, where *David* meaneth his *mothers wombe*, where he tooke flesh & so came into this worlde of men. And then likewise *Paul*
 * here meaneth only Christes taking our * *In Ephe. 4.*
 flesh, & his coming into this our world, in that he saith *hee descended to the lower partes of the earth*. So also † sense of these scrip. may
 be fitly cōpared with it. † *No man ascenderh vp to* † *Ioh. 3. 13.*
Heauen but he that descended from Heauen, the Sonne of man
which is in Heauen. And * *I came out from the Father and* * *Ioh. 16. 28.*
came into the world: againe I leaue the world, and go to the
Father. Euen so these wordes, *He descended to the lower partes of the Earth*, with opposition to his *Ascending into Heaue*, in this sense may signifie generally his abasement, in taking flesh in his mothers wombe, and so his coming into this our world, before hee was exalted in his Ascension. Lastly, others doe thinke, that this Greeke

* Psal. 86. 13.
Ez. 14. 10.

* Mat. 12. 40

† Eph. 4. 9, 10

* Not after his death, but before his death.

oppositiō thus stāding betwene *℥* Liuing & the Dead & betwene their proper habitations, nor betwene the *Liuing* & *Hell*. The same sēse manifestly hath another Hebrue phrase very like to this: * *Sheol tachah* or *tachah*, where thogh many think *Hel* is signified, yet surely *℥* circumstances do conuince that the *Graue* only is there meant, the *Graue beneath*: as Mr. *Fulke* against *Gr. Martin* doth cleerlie proue. Which also we shall further declare & make manifest by *℥* phrase "in the heart of the earth, as we shall see presently in the answer to the next Scripture objected afterward. But if any yet say touching this, *℥* heere is opposed Christs lowest debasing to his highest ascending. Now *Hell* is the lowest debasing of Christ, not *℥* *Graue*. Therefore *Hell* is heere vnderstoode, & not the *Graue*. Surely thus by this reason it must follow *℥* Christ not only was in *Hell*, but *℥* he suffered also in *Hell*. For indeed it was a far greater humiliatiō of Christ to suffer the paines of *Hel* (which we haue proued before that he might & did suffer indeed) thē to be locally in *Hell* with triumph without suffering. But it is most false & iniurious to Christes death to say, he suffered in the lower parts of the Earth, taking the same for *Hell*. Therefore his debasement here we take in the estimatiō of the world, *℥* is so far as they might sensibly conceiue of his miserable & base cōdition. Now that could be no lower thē the *Graue*. As for *Hel*, both his going thither, & his suffering of it, whether in *℥* very place,

or out of the place, all this was insensible to the world, & not coming within their estimation: & so not heere spoken of nor intended, where only the *apparent baseness* of Christ is compared with the *apparent going up* of Christ about the sensible Heavens. Thus do I iudge that the descending of Christ *to the lower partes of the earth* may be taken truly, plainly, and as is agreeable to the Hebrue phrase whence surely this Greek phrase ariseth, namely for Christs humiliation euen vnto the *Grave*, that is to becom *vnder the power of Death*. Howbeit some do thinke, it may be take as direct-
lie alluding to that *† metaphorically* Hebrue *† Psal. 139. 19* phrase *tachytot erets*, the lower partes of the earth, where *David* meaneth his *mothers wombe*, where he tooke flesh & so came into this worlde of men. And then likewise *Paul* * here meaneth only Christes taking our * *In Ephe. 4.* flesh, & his coming into this our world, in that he saith *hee descended to the lower partes of the earth*. So also *†* sense of these scrip. may be fitly cōpared with it. *† No man ascenderh vp to † Ioh. 3. 13.* *Heauen but he that descended from Heauen, the Sonne of man which is in Heauen.* And * *I came out from the Father and * Ioh. 16. 28.* *came into the world: againe I leaue the world, and go to the Father.* Euen so these wordes, *He descended to the lower partes of the Earth*, with opposition to his *Ascending into Heaue*, in this sense may signifie generally his abasement, in taking flesh in his mothers wombe, and so his coming into this our world, before hee was exalted in his Ascension. Lastly, others doe thinke, that this Greeke

Hypallage.

phrase *eis katitera mere ses gas*, to the lower partes of the earth, is no Hebraisme, but onely a figure of speech in the Greeke, a kinde of *Hypallage*: the lower partes of the earth, for the Earth which is the lower partes of the world. And so both these later senses do adde nothing in signification touching Christes *Descending* or his comming from Heauen into this world: but they meane onlie and generally, He first descended before he ascended. And this last sense *amplifyeth* it (as it were) by a kinde of description, shewing what this world, or this earth is where we liue, and whither Christ descended; euen the lower partes of the world in comparison of the Heauens whence he descended, and whither afterwarde from the earth he went vp againe.

Either of these two later senses might heere very well serue: but I iudge rather the first to be likeliest. Howsoeuer it bee, to dreame heere of *Hel* there is no reason. And this wee shall make further to appeare by confuting the next and last obiection of Mat. 12.40.

• Mat. 12.40.

In * this place therefore Christ is saide to haue bene *three dayes and three nights in the heart of the Earth*. What is that, but in the midst of the earth? And how was Christ there, vnles he were there in *Hell*? I answer, this also is a manifest *Hebraisme*, like to † that: *Tyrus was very glorious in the heart of the Seas: beleh iammim*. Tyrus was not in the

† Ezech. 27.
25, 26.

deepe

INTO HELL PROPERLY.

145

edge of the sea, nor in the *middest* of the sea, for it stood close by the continent land; as Geography teacheth vs: but the Prophets meaning by that phrase is, that Tyrus was *compassed about with the Sea*, though standing neere to the Sea shore. Euen so Christ in his *Grave* may well bee said to bee *in the heart of the earth* after that phrase: that is *compassed about with the earth* though far from the middest of the earth, euen a little beneath the vpmost parte of the same, as *Graves* are wont to bee made. Further this cannot possibly be meant of Christes *Soule going into Hell*; because the Iewes heere asked Christ for a *visible signe*, & he said he would giue them *a signe*: that is to say a visible miracle. Now this miracle was, how Christ should be 3. dayes & 3. nights buried in the earth, and then rise againe to life: like Ionahs comming againe into the world after hee had bene 3. dayes and 3. nights in the Fishes belly. In this only hee would condescend vnto them, and giue them only this visible signe, like as they craued, but not any more. Therefore this cannot bee any going to *Hell* and comming thence againe: for that had ben vtterly no *visible signe*, neither had he answered any whit to their desire at all, as the text saith he did, namely to giue them this *one signe* only so as they desired, and as might bee cōparable in their sense to that of Ionah. Again if heere *the heart*

K

9

145 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

of the earth be Hell, then was Christ all the time of his death in Hell even till the moment of his resurrection, which thing the chiefe defenders of this dreame dare not

* Luke 23. 43.

avouch: and that of * Luke refuteth it, *This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*: as anon God willing, we shall further see. There-

† Mat. 12. 40.

fore the heart of the earth there must nor in any wise be take for Hell. Which also that speech of Christ now a dying, *Father into thy handes I commend my Spirit*, doth evidentlie prove. Where Christ sheweth (according to the usuall phrase of men in such a case) that hee hoped presently to goe to Heaven. No man thinketh to go to Hell, whē he saith, *Lord into thy handes I commend my Soule*: no more therefore now did Christ, as

* Pag. 191.

* Ephe. 4. 9.

is further shewed "afterward. Lastly, both against this and * that last before, thus I reason: If these Textes speake of Hell, then certainlie Hell is in the lowest partes of the earth, in the midst of the earth. But it could never bee affirmed directlie and preciselie that Hell is in the *middest* or deepest of the earth. Nay it is most false.

† 1. Pet. 3. 4.

* Math. 8. 28

Ephe. 2. 2.

Obiection.

For the Divells are † holden in Hell. But the Divells are locallie "on the earth, and in the ayre. Therefore Hell is not preciselie in the *middest* of the Earth. Some will say,

† Prou. 15. 24

Answers.

Hell is beneath, as the † Scripture teacheth. I answered, if you translate that so, yet it sayeth not Hell beneath &c, but Hell beneath. That is in comparison of Heaven, whiche

Is on *High*: so Hell maye bee *downward* from Heaven, but hee sayeth not in respect of vs here on earth. Secondly, They who take this for the *Grave*, and the Bodilie destruction (as the worde in deede verie often, and familiarlie doeth also signifie) doe easilie auoyde this Obiection. Thirdlie, it is not the vnlikeliest to hold, that *Sheol* heere signifying the *state of death* or *destruction in this world*, *Marrab*, declining or *downward*: Considering also and comparing the former parte of this verse with this later, & the next following likewise: It seemeth the *wise man* sayeth: The way of life to the wise tendeth after things on *high*, whereby hee escapeth *destruction*, the way whereof is *graveling* on the earth, and seeketh not the things that are aboue, which bring *life*, but the things that are *beneath*, which are snares of death. And thus heere may be some affinitie with the Exhortation * to seeke the things *aboue*, and not the things that be earthly *beneath*. But heere is no locall assignation for Hell. You will saye, Where then is Hell, is there no certaine locall place of tormentes to the reprobates nowe? We doubt not but the wicked and the Diuels are now *locally* tormented in som certain place, & shalbe after this world ended: but where this is the Scripture teacheth not, neither ought we to inquire after it, but to learne howe by all meanes to auoyde it.

K. 1

Thus

* Col. 3. 1, 2.

Obiection.

Answer.

† Luke 16. 23.

Nothing in all
the Scripture
for Christs go-
ing to Hell:
therefore it is
a fable.

Thus farre the Scriptures haue bene ex-
amined, and nothing in them is found to
proue *Christs Soules going to Hell*. Wich about
all things ought to be; I saye somewhat
ought to be in Scripture for it, if we will
haue such an Article of our faith. And I
demaund, are not they *Haretikes* that will
needes holde an Article of Faith meere-
ly without Scripture, as well as they that
will not receaue something expresse in
Scripture? Well: to beleecue therefore a-
nie article of our faith, it is requisite that
we haue the Scriptures warrant. Yea fur-
ther, it ought not onely to be in the Scrip-
ture, but it ought to be very plaine, ex-
presse, and most easie to be proued out of
Scripture: or els in no wise to make it a
maine Article of our common Faith. But
all men know, and our Aduersaries here-
in confesse; it is a hard, a doubtfull, and
a verry intricat point, and with much diffi-
culty to be proued in Scripture, that *Chri-
stes Soule went downe into Hell*. There-
fore them selues graunt in effect that this
doctrine ought not to be any part of our
common *Credo*.

The Scriptures
are clearely a-
gainst *Christs*
going into Hel.

I.
*Luke. 23. 43.

Nay further I vtge, if wee consider the
Scriptures vnpartiallie, we do find diuers
singular places in them against this do-
ctrine, prouing; his soule after his death
was not in Hell. First, * *This day thou shalt
be with me in Paradise*. This is spoken of the
Humaniety of Christ. But not of his Body which lay

*in the Gospels: Therefore of his Soule, that it wente
the same day presentlie into Paradise, and then
into Hell. If you denie that this is meant of
his Humanitie, I proue it most plainlie.*

1. This *Participle Mea*, is more pregnant
then *Son*, to signifie a *mutuall participation* of
somewhat. So that if we note the empha-
sis of this phrase well, *mea* *emou* *est* is as
much as to say *This day I shall haue parte with
thee, and thou with me of a blessed change*, that
is, from this miserable Crosse which now
we both suffer, to Paradise, whither wee
shall both goe hence presentlie. But this
is true of his *Humane Soule*, not of his *Deitie*,
to participate with the Theefe, and the
Theefe with him both in sorrow & ioye.
Therefore he meaneth heere his *Soule* shall
be presently *to day* in *Paradise*. Againe, this
speech is directlie and purposelie a Con-
solation to the Holy Theefe, certifying
him that he should see quickly an altera-
tion in the things that now he sorrowed
for. But he sorrowed grieuously both for
his owne miserie and for Christes most
vnworthy torments, as may be seene pre-
sentlie before he receaued this cōsolati-
on. Therefore this Consolation sheweth
him, that Christ should be translated also
as wel as him selfe very quickly from the
Crosse into glorie. Lastly, the good Theef
saith to Christ as *Man* being yet in misery,
but beleeuing he should shortly bee in
glorie, *But remember me when thou comest into*

T. 103. 42.

150 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT
thy kingdome. As if he should say, Lord, I see
well thy wofull miserie now, but I know
thou shalt hence goe into thy glorious
kingdome: remember me therefore when
thou comest thither. This is now altogether
gather of Christes *Manhead*. Must not
Christes aunswere bee iust to his sense,
Speciallie seeing he aunswereth to Com-
fort him in his forenoted griefe? Yes ver-
relie. He aunswereth therefore to this
effect. Be of good cheere, this day I shall
in deed come into my kingdome, and thy
selfe with me. That is *Me*, whom now
thou grieuest to see thus afflicted, & who
thou belieuest to goe hence to a king-
dome, even *me*, though now in deepe an
afflicted *man*, yet to day thou shalt see in
my kingdome in Paradise. And therefore
this worde *semerum* to day seemeth also to
haue a contrarie reference to this his state
now, and this now, contrarie to that to
day insuing quicklie afterwarde. As if
he should saye, *Nowe afflicted*, but *presently*
anew in glorie. All this must needs be of his
Humane Soule verily without all question:
There is none can consider heerein his
Deitie. Ifanie thinke his *Soule* might goe
to *Hele* first, and yet presentlie goe thence
to *Heaue* yet night also. That is ridiculous
and toyish: it needeth maruelous plaine
scripture to describe that, or els we ought
to hold it as a singular fable. It was now
within 2 or 3 houres of the dayes ende,
when

INTO HELL PROPERLY.

when Christ spake this: so that hee had neede to goe quicke, & come quicke, and tarry but a little there. Well this place the I doubt not, is very plaine against Christs Soules descending into Hell.

Likewise **Father into thy handes I commend my soule.* What if Gods hand sometime doth signifie his generall protection onely and gouernement? But consider the present circumstance here: Christ was now on the Crosse so piteously oppressed with sorrowes, as that he seemed a forlorne man, & forsake not of men onely, but of God to; yet he enen now being about to yeelde vp his life to death, lifting vp his hart to God in peace and great assurance, saith, *Father into thy handes I commend my soule.* Tell me, doe men vse thus to saye when they thinke to goe to Hell, or doe they not hope presentlie to inioye Heaven? And what els did Stephen, **laying, Lord, receiue my spirit.* Men in such case when they speak thus, declare a certaine hope in the that they shall speedilie be released from their sorrowes, and receaued into ioyes with God in Heaven. Thus is Gods hand taken heere agreeable to this common phrase of men. As also the Scripture hath it **In thy presence is fulnes of ioye, and at thy right hande are pleasures for euermore.* Wherefore Christ now hanging heere on the Crosse, and readie to dye, vnderstandeth Gods hande surelie in this manner.

2.

* verse 48

* Act. 7. 59

† Psal. 16. 12.

K 4

There

Gods Hande.

There is no man of sense considering the circumstances that can iudge otherwise. *Gods hande* therefore we say in this case signifieth the meanes wherby he taketh his seruantes to him self, and holdeth them with him selfe as his owne possessions, coming out of tribulation, wherein while they were, they seemed far of from God, and as it were out of his *hand* and possession, & subiect to their enemies power: but now commending their Soules *into Gods hande*, they declare their desire and hope to be rid from these separations, and to be there where they desire, that is receaued by *Gods hande* into his ioyfull presence and heauenly possession.

Obiection.

But they will saye, Dauid from whom these wordes are taken, did not presentlie after he spake thus, goe to Heauen. No more then may we think that Christ did, If Dauid the presentlie went not to Heauen, What then? I hope he went not to Hell, neither thought he of Hell when he spake so. Howsoeuer it was, this I saye, if Dauid were nowe a giuing vp the ghost, as Christ was when he thus spake, doubtles then he meant thereby that presentlie he hoped for Heauen. I graunt men sometime though not a dying, but beeing in grievous anguise and dangerous troubles whiche often tymes bringe euen death with them, then also they will commend their Soule into the hands of God.

Answer.

And

And so might *David* in this place whence Christ taketh this sentence: and yet nevertheless he desired and hoped for present release, and instead of his sorrow, present injoying of the Lordes comfort and ioyfull favour. Which in a measure and proportion is answerable to the attayning of Heauē, which they haue who depart hence. If any say, the Greeke word in the text *parathesimas* is *I will commend* noting that he look't not for present and immediat entring into Heauen, but in time heerafter. That is a most vaine and ignorant cauillation, proceeding from not considering the *Hebraisme* there in. For *David* in like maner hath *aphelid*, a worde *Future* in forme, but of the *present* time in sense, as is most frequent with the *Hebraei*, and as the very circumstances heere doe require it to be.

Third: In 1 Luke we see a generall and eternall Law set *estēkai* betweene Hell and Heauen, *that none in Hell can come to Heauen, nor out of Heauen into Hell.* This Law I say is confirmed more surely then that of the *Moses* & *Persons* which also might not be broken. Therefore Christ brake it not, neither went he down into Hell at all. If any say, true it is, this a generall and eternall Law for all other Creatures, that they can neuer passe to and fro being once in Hell, But Christ being the Son of God heerin was privileged aboue all other men, this was

† 26. 13.

3.
† Luke 16. 26.

Dan. 6.

Objection.

154. THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

was a thing peculiar to him. Is that a privilege for Christ to goe into Hell, and to come thence againe? A worthy privilege surely, and very honorable. All men would thinke it a greater honor neuer to haue come in Hell at all. But seeing it is so flatly contrarie to so *general a Law*, it becometh you to haue most cleere euidence and plaine prooffe in the worde to affirme it, or els wee haue great cause to abhorre it and to holde it no prerogative, but a thing verie iniurious and derogatory to the Man whiche was also the Sonne of God. Now what euidence and prooffe you haue for it which defend it, wee haue seene and tryed to bee more then vaine, if wee note them with any Indifferency. Seeing therefore he which *was like vs in all things (sinner onely excepted)* hath left him selfe no witnesse of this most strange and wondrous difference in him, why should wee dreame of such an *extraordinary case* so presumptuously? Further I reason thus: *If he triumphed not in Hell, hee went not into Hell. But hee triumphed not in Hell. Therefore hee went not into Hell at all.* The *Assumption* is proved: first, Seing *Triumph* is a word taken from the custom of men of warre, who hauing in battaile conquered their enemies doe vse to triumph over them. And this their *Triumph* then vse to make in the presense of such, as to whom the glory thereof doeth in parte appertainc.

Other reasons
that Christ
went not into
Hell.

1.

INTO HELL PROPERLY! 151

aine. But in Hell there were none with
Christ in whose presence he should tri-
umph, and to whom some parte of his glo-
rie might belong. There were none be-
sides, but the Diuells and damned soules.
Therefore it is absurd to say Christ triumphed
in Hell. A againe, where Christ actually & man-
ifestly triumphed there began his glorification. But it
is not absurd, yea of all absurdities the great-
est to say Hell was the beginninge of Christs
glorification. Therefore certainly Christe did not
triumph in Hell. Some will say hee might
as well triumph in Hell, as on the Crosse.
Howe could Christ triumphe on the
Crosse, as we interpret that he did: He tri-
umphed on the same Crosse. Hee was there in
sore torments, and in most pitious plight.
Call ye that a triumph? I answer, wee ne-
uer saide, nor the Apostle meante that
Christ triumphed actually on the Crosse,
but virtually as I may say. That is the vir-
tue and efficacie of that death did not
bring destruction to the sufferer but to
the Doer and to the executioner, that
is to the Diuell: with whom hee spiritu-
allie combated there euen vntill death,
and by death was not vanquished, but did
vanquish him that had the power of death,
that is the Diuell: and him selfe tri-
umphed. Which effect is contrarie in all o-
ther battaills and confictes. For with
vs they who are slaine in fight, are con-
quered, and the suruiuer triumpheth.

But

Objection

† Col. 2. 15.

Answer.

How Christ is
said to triumph
on the Crosse.

136 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

But the Holy Ghost giueth vs to knowe the *contrarie* touching Christ and his sufferings. For his *suffering* was his *victorie*, & his *dying* his *triumph*. But he meaneth not *actually*: for while hee suffered, and while he dyed, this was a miserable triumph: and still he suffered, even till he gave vp the Ghost. Therefore the meaning heere is not of any *actuell* triumph: but onely by *virtue* of that which there he suffered, hee triumphed indeed, and the *Crosse* whereon he was lifted vp was like a *triumphing Chariot*. All this is thus named because the *effect* of those sufferings simple was the moſte perſite treading vnder feet of Satan and of all infernall powers. But nowe his *triumphing in Hell* can be nothing ſo. Either in Hell it was *actuell*, which is monſtrous abſurd: for then Hell was the entrance of his *Glorifying*, which all the worlde knoweth is the moſte inglorious and vileſt debaſinge. Or at leaſt his verie preſence was *meritorious*, and *triumphantly* *triumphant*: and this is flatly blaſphemous againſt the allſufficient merits of the *Crosse* of Chriſt.

Heere ſome will aſke, howe doth this derogate from the *Crosse* of Chriſte, if hee triumphed in Hell? Because hee triumphed *on his Crosse*, yea perſitlie: therefore hee did not in Hell. But it is doubted; yea denyed that Chriſt triumphed at all on the *Crosse*. Let the Scripture then ſpeake.

Objection.

Answer.

In vs. *hypocrites* *demons* what *Dem* was any way
 against vs. he tooke it out of the way, and fastened it to the
 Crosse, having spoyled Principallities and powers, made a
 show of them openly, and hath triumphed over them in
 the same Crosse. They except heere against
 this translation, namely of the last words,
 as if the true reading were not *en* *any* in the
 same with reference to Crosse, but *en* *himselfe*
 in himselfe. We answer: First, Howsoever
 the reading bee, this doctrine cannot bee
 impeached notwithstanding, that *Christ* *on*
the Crosse did all those meritorious and tri-
 umphant actions over sinne and Sathan
 which are heere in the *Colossians* specified.
 I say this doctrine is manifest still, even
 by the expresse wordes which are there
 found: If you translate *he triumphed in him-*
selfe, the meaning is *by himselfe there on the*
Crosse. For all those words & phrases they
 have apparant & vndenyable coherence
 and certaine reference to that tyme and
 place: *He put out the hand writing of ordinances*
that was any way against vs, he even tooke it out of
the way fastening it to the Crosse. *having* (then
 also) *spoyled Principallities and powers, hee made*
a show of them openly *having triumphed over them*
by himselfe. By himselfe? where? enen there, *on*
the Crosse most apparantly. For where he
 took away all things that made any way
 against vs, there he spoyled the Diuells &
 triumphed over the: all the words heere
 beeing jointly of one and the same tyme,
 and that also not the future, but the tyme
 now past. But he tooke away all things any
 way

1. 1. 1.

1. 1. 1.

1. 1. 1.

1. 1. 1.

1. 1. 1.

1. 1. 1.

1. 1. 1.

136 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

But the Holy Ghost giuerh vs to knowe the *contrarie* touching Christ and his sufferings. For his *suffering* was his *victorie*, & his *hanging* his *triumph*. But he meaneth not *actually*: for while hee suffered, and while he dyed, this was a miserable triumph: and still he suffered, even till he gaue vp the Ghost. Therefore the meaning heere is not of any *actuell* triumph: but onely by *virtue* of that which there he suffered, hee triumphed indeed, and the *Crosse* whereon he was lifted vp was like a *triumphing Chariot*. All this is thus named because the *effect* of those sufferings simple was the moſte perſite treading vnder feet of Satan and of all infernall powers. But nowe his *triumphing in Hell* can be nothing ſo. Either in Hell it was *actuell*, which is monſtrous abſurd: for then Hell was the entrance of his *Glorifying*, which all the worlde knoweth is the moſte inglorious and vileſt debaſinge. Or at leaſt his verie preſenſe was *meritorious*, and *virtually triumphing*: and this is flatly blaſphemous againſt the allſufficient merit of the *Croſſe* of Chriſt.

Heere ſome will aſke, howe doth this derogate from the *Croſſe* of Chriſte, if hee triumphed in Hell? Because hee triumphed *on his Croſſe*, yea perſitlie: therefore hee did not in Hell. But it is doubted; yea denyed that Chriſt triumphed at all on the *Croſſe*. Let the Scripture then ſpeake

Dilemma

Objection

Answer

be vs by *himselfe* because what *he* was any way
against vs he took it out of the way, and fastned it to the
Crosse, having spoyled Principallities and powers, made a
show of them openly, and hath triumphed over them on
the same Crosse. They except heere against
this translation, namely of the last words,
as if the true reading were not *en* *aut* in the
same with reference to Crosse, but *en* *hanc*
in himselfe. We answer: First, Howsoever
the reading bee, this doctrine cannot bee
impeached notwithstanding, that *Christ* on
the Crosse did all those meritorious and tri-
umphant actions over sinne and Sathan
which are heere in the *Evangelium* specified.
I say this doctrine is manifest still, even
by the expresse wordes which are there
found: If you translate *he triumphed in him-
selfe*, the meaning is *by himselfe there on the
Crosse*. For all those words & phrases they
have apparant & vndenyable coherence
and certaine reference to that tyme and
place: *He put out the hand writing of ordinances
that was any way against vs, he even took it out of
the way fastning it to the Crosse.* having (then
also) *spoyled Principallities and powers, hee made
a show of the openly* having triumphed over them
by himselfe. By himselfe? where? enen there
on the Crosse most apparantly. For where he
took away all things that made any way
against vs, there he spoyled the Diuells &
triumphed over the: all the words heere
beeing jointly of one and the same tyme,
and that also not the future, but the tyme
now past. But he tooke away all things any
way

41.2.0210

01.01.01

17.01.01

10.01.01

01.01.01

10.01.01

*Triumph

for

158 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**

way against vs *in the Crosse*, and fastened
the hande writing of our inditement *in*
the Crosse, the text sayeth. Therefore all
the reste was *there* don also. Whereunto
other Scriptures also beeing compared
doe giue further light. ** Through death he*

• Heb. 2. 14.

destroyed, not simply conquered, but destroy-
ed and abolished him that had the power of death,
that is the Diuell. And this is the true sense
also of that finall speech of his, beeing
about to strike the laste blowe at his ad-
uersary. *† It is finished.* What is finished?

† Joh. 19. 30.

surely all that hee had to doe with *any ad-*
uersary, or any contrary thing to our freedom;
euen there and then hee finished it. And

• Joh. 12. 31.

hereof is that yehementre "speech of
Christ though spoken before he was ap-
prehended: *Now is the iudgement of this worlde:*
now shall the Prince of this worlde be cast out. Hee
saith *cast out*, as if hee neuer appeared any
more in his sight after that most absolute

• How spake of
the death that
he should dye?
ver. 31.
¶ Pag. 61.

victory *on the Crosse*: ** for thereof he spea-*
keth in this place, as † before wee haue
seene. Thus then appeareth plainly this
doctrine, that *Christ on the Crosse* did all and
every one of his victorious actions against
Sathā, & wrought meritoriously our full
deliuerance fro him, so that no ior of his
rights nor power against vs remayned af-
ter that, but there *hee spoyled him*, there *hee*
confidently triumphed, and *made a shew openy of*
him, and trode him vnder foote for euer:
he so beate him & so destroyed his power
that

that there was no feare; any thing should
once stirre against him, or vs afterward.
This is meant by *Christes triumphing on the
Crosse*. For els indeed a pitious triumph it
was, where himselfe remayned in such
wofull tormets, where appeared no shew
of conquest, but rather of being conquere-
red. Therefore this is spoken *in regard of*
the effect which came of this action, not of
the simple action (or rather *passion*) it self.
What effect? An effect rare and strange;
nothing like, yea contrarie to that which
happeneth in like case amongst men.
When they in fight are beaten, & wound-
ed, and slaine, they are conquered: but
Christ even in being beaten, and wound-
ed, and slaine, therein hee conquered,
and triumphed, and led openlie his ene-
mies in captiuitie. Nowe hee saith openly,
not that Christe did this openly and eu-
dently to our senses, but alluding to the
maner of conquerours in their trium-
phes, who lead in open shew those enemyes
which henceforth cannot once stirre a-
gainst them any more: so hee signifieth
that the effect of Christes very death was such,
and so forcible indeede, and fully to bee
compared with these doings of perfect con-
querours; and therefore most emphatically he
setteth it out in these termes.

Thus farre this doctrine is iustified of
Christes triumphing on the Crosse, howsoever
the reading be in those last words of that
text.

*His triumph
on the Crosse
was in regard
of the effect
which it
brought.*

166 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

Col. 2. 15.

2e 4.

¶ Humil. in
Sed. 4.

at Cypri. de
Passione.
* Ieron. Al-
ga. quib. 3.

Objection.

† Luk. 11. 21.
22.

text. Howbeit the trueth is, this reading
as *Beza* in the same Crosse, which wee in our
common translations vse after *Beza*, is no
forgetie of *Beza*. But that noble instru-
ment of God doeth shewe, as many other
things most worthie and profitable to the
Church of God, so this to bee no new, but
a most ancient, and in all likelihood, the
common reading in old time, or at least
to that very effect. *Occumensis* the Greeke
Scholiast doeth both read and interpret
this place plainly thus: who commonly
sheweth what the Greeke Churches vse
was *Origen* who was farre elder, if he read
not *ante* in the same Crosse, yet he read *ex
style in ligno* on the tree, which in effect is all
one. And thus not onely *Origen*, but also
* *Eyprian*, * *Ierome*, with many others. So
that if a Romish Priest had traduced Mr
Beza for leaving heere their vulgar Latin
translation, it had bene shamefull wrong
to that faithfull seruant of God: Howe
much more when brethré, as they seeme,
doe so disgrace him, or rather the trueth
of God in him? Thus then it is manifest
that *Christ triumphed ouer Satan on the Crosse*.
And then to doe it againe in *Hell* were su-
perfluous and vaine: nay it were iniuri-
ous to the Crosse of *Christ*, as if it were not
sufficiently nor perfectly there done.

If any say, That parable in the Gospel
signifieth as much, that *Christ* bound the
Diuell in *Hell*. ¶ *When a strong man armed hee-*
perh

perth his pallace, the things that he possesseth are in peace. But when a stranger then he commeth vpon him, and ouercometh him, hee taketh from him, all his armour, and deuiderth his spoiles. This strong mans Palace is Hell, where Christ, which is the stranger man comming vpon Sathan, spoyleth him, &c. A fine toy, or rather a shamefull gloze, by vnsauoury Allegorizing so to corrupt the text. Is this a good way to proue articles of Faith, viz. by allegories? A better sense heereof may be giuen, and more to Christes purpose. That is, Christ really dispossessed Sathā out of some in those times that were once real-ly possessed; but afterward by him, a stranger then Sathan, cleerely freed. Also consequentlie it may be meant of the Spirituall casting out of Sathā out of Gods elect, who by Nature through sinne hath possession of all men: but by Gods grace and the Ministry of his worde, he is cast out when Christ calleth vs and sanctifyeth vs vnto himselfe. Wherefore in a worde there is no holde for you in the Scriptures, but they are vtterlie against all going downe of Christ into Hell.

Which we may gather likewise by the Historie of the Euangelistes, who write the doings of Christ exactlie, all that † wee ought to beleue: and of all other, his Death and Resurrection most specially. But in all of them there is not a worde of any going downe to Hell. Therefore there is no

L such

Answer.

Eph. 2, 4.

3.

† Ioh. 20. 30.
31.

162 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**
such thing to bee beleueed.

The very Apostolike Creed found in Scripture wanteth this article of Christs going to Hell after Death.

** 1. Cor. 15. 2, 3, 4.*

The very same in effect seemeth to haue ben deliuered to this same purpose by Christ himselfe Luk. 24. 46. 47.

† Rom. 8.

Which also may further appeare by that singular recapitulation in the Apostle of certaine precise Articles of our faith, and namelie of these wherein *Christes full victorie* for our perfite deliuerance is orderlie and sufficiently set downe, as the Church it seemeth generally held in those tymes.

** I haue chieflye deliuered vnto you, that which I haue receaued, that Christ "died for our finnes according to the Scripture, and that hee was buried, and that he arose the thirde day according to the Scriptures. This was the full foundation of Faith in those dayes, by which if a man beleueed he might be saued, and which if he beleueed not, hee beleueed it in vaine.*

Whence it ariseth that Paul had heere great and iust occasion to haue specified this seuerall and waighrie Article, that Christ went also into Hell, if anie such thing were then beleueed. Hee nameth the Articles both before and after this His *Dying, Buriall, and Resurrection*: hee ought not to haue skipped his *Going into Hell*, to saue vs from Hell, if those wordes in our common Creede had anie such meaning, if it had any diuers meaning from all those merioned articles, and so waighrie a sense as some suppose. It will not be excused to say, The Apostle meant heere to prooue our Resurrection onely: and therefore would speake of purpose, but onely of Christes Death and Resurrection

INTO HELL PROPERLY. 101

tion, from whence he might argue out
likewise. I graunt, that this is his maine
purpose in deede: but when hee sayeth,
Except you haue beleneed in vayne, he meaneth
that wee beleeue in vayne, not onely if wee
holde not the Resurrection, but also if
we holde not those speciall Articles of
Faith touching Christes sufferings and vica-
torie for vs, which there presentlie hee na-
meth: and consequentlie if wee holde
them, then that we beleeue not in vaine, but
euen those to be sufficient. Whence it fol-
loweth, and it is most certaine, that their
fancie of Christes going downe into Hell, is su-
perfluous, and excluded out of this vn-
doubted *Apostles Creed*, and part of the Ho-
lie Scriptures.

Thus farre wee haue seene the Scrip-
tures against this deuice: Nowe it were
good to see if there bee any *use* at all
or *ende*, that his Descendinge into Hell
may haue. If there can bee no *ende* nor
use at all, no benefite to the Godlie there-
by, then it is idle, and vaine, and a very
dreame, and nothinge els. But there
can be no certaine *use* at all, and especial-
lie no commoditie nor benefite to the
Godly by it. Therefore it is a dreame.
For what good is there so much as pre-
tended? The generall Redemption of all
Gods elect & chosen people was wrought
and fullie finished on the Crosse, euen
to the Cancelling of the very writings,

*No end nor use
of Christes go-
ing locally into
Hell after his
death Therefore
he went not.*

5.

164. **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**

and taking away of whatsoeuer was anie way against vs: as hath bene shewed before. What could his *going downe into Hell* adde more? Neither was it any peculiar good to the godlie then deceased before: for they were all in Heaven immediatlie euen then, as well as we that dye since: as we haue proued already. If then it be no way profitable to any of Gods children, what if it were so that the *Diuells* and *reprobate* in Hel might be *more confounded* by such his locall descending? yet see I not, neither can I beleene *howe it may be amongst the Articles of our Creede*, all which in truth *awaye* singularly to Gods owne childrens speciall good. It can not be I say in the *Articles* of our faith, if it directly profit not the Godly. Yea and touching the further daunting and confounding of the damned; that is a sillie shift God knoweth, & I waynest reason of all, that Christ should goe to *triumph* and *insult* vpon the thrise miserable and wofull wretches in their present vnspeakeable Damnation infinitlie confounded already. Sure a very *sonie triumph* this were for the Sonne of GOD, which euen among me were nothing but dishonorable. Yea a beast, the *Lion*, they say, hauing but the instinct of Nature, yet he refuseth to insult and pray vpon the pitiefull & helples creatures. And would the *Lion of the Tribe of Iudah* take pleasure to goe thither only to insult farther vpon the

the miserable damned? I deny not but the wicked in torments might conceaue further horror, and the blessed in heauē further ioyes by the actuall death of Christ: but that might full easilie bee by the vertue and efficacie of the power of the Godhead deriuing some sence thereof to all, howe and when it pleaseth him. There needed *no locall Descending into Hell*, nor *Ascending to Heauen* for that matter. Neyther in deed did hee *Descende*, because it is certaine he did not *Ascende* for any such purpose, for ought that we any where reade. Neither surely should the Damned haue bene visited *first*, and the Blessed *last*, yea so long after, that is 40. dayes after his death was past. But contrariwise the Godlie in all reason should *first* haue had his presence to certifie them, and then the Wicked *afterward*, if any such *locall* coming and going for giuing notice had bene required. Wherefore this remayneth that there was no life, no good at all by Christes Soules descending into Hell. And Mr Hall in saying *"Hee thereby personally redeemed vs from Hell, and if Christ's Soule had not, Daniels Soule must, and his, & ours haue gone to Hell"*, doth no lesse then derogate from the Crosse of Christ, and blaspheme his allsufficient death. Also if his Soule *must* goe thirther of necessitie to saue our soules thence, why went not his Body too, for to saue our bodyes thence? But of these presumptuous & grosse vanities

5.

6.

A had affec-

tion.

" Hill Sol. 24

" Sol. 2.

7.

166 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**
nities we have sayd enough, & to much
alreadie, but that necessitie hath infor-
ced vs.

Howbeit yet let vs goe a little further.
The *Creede* it selfe being viewed and mar-
ked, will plainly yeelde another meaning
of these words, through a right *distributing*
of the Articles thereof: *viz.* those that
concerne Christes Office in being our Sa-
uour and Redeemer. These are all of 3
sortes: some touching his *Humiliation*, and
some his *Glorification*. The Articles of Chri-
stes *Humiliation* I suppose euery sensible
man will confesse to be these, *Hee suffered,*
was Crucified, Dead, Buried, Descended to the
Dead, or to Hell: and those of his *Glorification*
to be only these: *The third day he rose againe,*
he Ascended into Heauen; he siteth at the right
hande of God, and thence he shall come to iudge-
ment. Which if it be the very naturall and
necessarie *Diuision* of these Articles of the
Creede, as it is in deede, the this buerthro-
weth wholly their opiniõ, and stablisheth
ours, that Christ went not downe into
Hell: namely *not to triumph*, for then this
was not the lowest point of his *Humiliatio*,
but the first of his *Glorification*. Which can
stand with no sense in this place; & there-
fore he descended not by our very *Creede*
into Hell at all.

9.
By the very or-
der of our *Creed*
Christ went not
into Hell.

10.
By other *suffi-*
cient Creedes
Christ went not
into Hell.

Moreover we finde almost all the *Creeds*
and Rules of Christian faith, certainlie
the most & the ancientest & the best (be-
side

INTO HELL PROPERLY.

167

side this called the *Apostolike Creed* to want these wordes of *Christes descending* altogether. These *Creedes* or *summes* of our faith we finde in * *Ignatius*, † *Irenaeus*, * *Iust. Mart.*, * *Tertull.*, † *Origen*, * *Athanas*, * *Augustin*, *Synodoli Nic. Constantinop.* 1. *Toletan.* 1. and † *Ephesus* 1. &c. Which whosoeuer did hold, they were euer acknowledged true and sound Christians. And God forbid that such precise and exact *Summaries* of Christianitie should be thought defective in any needfull point. Therefore all these neuer thought that *Christes going downe into Hell* (as some now vrge it) was any distinct and certaine *Article* of Christiā faith. But how then is it possible that these perfit and famous *Creede* should want that whiche our common *Creede* hath? Surely * *Ruffinus* sheweth, *Vs Verbis eadem videtur esse, in eo quod scriptum dicitur*. The effect of this *Article* *He descended to Infernum* icometh (sayeth he) to bee the same with this, *Hee was buried*. Whereby euen the *Ancients* do appeare to cōsent with vs here in effect, that these wordes of *Christis going to Hades or Infernum* in our *Creede* doe signifie no more in deed, then the former wordes there signified, and that this was added but for *Emphasis* sake to shewe more plainly that he was truly dead in deede, as we before obserued. And certainly vnles this were so, all those moſte excellent *Creedes* before mentioned, ought not in any wise so vterly to want it, as they doe.

* *Ad Magnu*
† *Lib. 1 cap. 2.*
* *Apol 1*
* *De preser.*
aduers. her. &
conu. Prae.
† *De princip.*
* *Ad Epictet.*
* *Ad Pet.*
Diac.
† *Cap. 12.*

* *In Symbol.*
Noto Ruffinus,

† *Page 122.*
125.

168 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

Also howe generallie this was wantinge, *Raffinus* sheweth heerewithall, *Secundum sanctum est quod in Ecclesia Romana Symbolo non habetur additum, Descendit ad inferna, sed nec in Orientali Ecclesia habetur hic Sermo*: Wee must knowe verilie, that the Church of Romes Creed hath not this added, Hee went vnto the Dead, neyther is this clause in the East Churches. But so generally, and so farr and wide in the Cristian worlde, a necessarie Article, distinct from the rest, neyther was, nor could be wanting: specially seeing they all found it in the *Apostolike Creed* expressly put in. Therefore it must needes be, I thinke, they all tooke it but to signifie in effect the same as *Dead and Buried*: yea euen in the common *Creede* called *Apostolike*. And therefore they sometime vsed those expresse wordes, & sometime they vsed them not: and yet they neuer differed, they neither abounded nor wanted in their maine sense. And so it could not meane with them, *that Christ went to Hell*.

* *Athanas.*
Symb. &c.

Obiection.

Answer.

Now it remaineth *Et res ad Triarios redeat*, that this matter may bee holpen with the last, the best, & the only succour: that is some of the particular *Fathers*. What say they? Doe they teach that Christ after death, went downe into *Hell*. I denye that also: the *Fathers* teach not so. Taking *Hell* as in English properly we always meane, for the very place of the damned. I graunt many of them thought that he went to *Limbus patrum*: though this name bee not found in them, but was framed by the *School-*

Since. Howbeit such a place they dreamed of, as was out of *Heaven*, they thought in *deep* of the earth, whence he fetch'd the soules of *3* Patriarks out, & carried the vp with him to *Heaven*. Which opinion the Papistes haue laid fast hold on since euē till this day, hauing also increased it with other fables. And thus in deed som of *3* *Auncients* imagined & ghesled by reason of their mistaking of the Greeke *Hades* in the cōmon *Cred*, and in the Scriptures, and som what also by mistaking the old vse of the Latin *Inferi*, wherwith they commonly vsed to translate *Hades*, as before I haue largely declared. When they once mistooke these words, and specially *Hades*, to signifie *Hell* properly, then they could not but devise some likely matter of it, & some purpose for it, which els had bene ridiculous. And yet euen heerein they spake waveringlie & ambiguoslie: a token indeed that they spake they knew not what, as in * *Augustin* we may see. But * *August. Epist.* I hope with vs euery where. *all has sampson. 99.*
dem explosa sententia est, This old rotten error is abhorred: which I also haue refuted brieflie before. How be it in a worde, the *Fathers* knewe not this our present opinion in Controversie now, that he went locallie into the Hell of the damned, and not to any *Limbo*. Herein they that hold against vs haue no helpe at the *Fathers* handes, whatsoeuer they pretend. It begi
not

The Fathers
are not for
Christ descend-
ing into the
Hell of the
Damned.

176 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**

not I suppose till about Mai. *Laters* time;
 when they saw somewhat of the Popish
 errours here in, but could not presently
 bee purged from all their filth. Now
 since that tyme diuers of our Protestants,
 though they left in deed the olde Popish
Limbo, yet not discerning but that surely
 Christ went into *Hell* after death (because
 I thinke sundrie of the Fathers in wordes
 make shewe of some such vncouth thing)
 therefore they deuised a fresh howe this
 might be, and wherefore. Some thought
 to suffer torments there, some not to suf-
 fer in anie wise, but to triumph forsooth
 in *Hell*, and some knewe not why he went
 to *Hell*, but thither he went they thought.
 And some, that hee went and came a-
 gayne from thence presently, not staying
 two houres in *Hell*; others that he stayed
 there all the while till his Resurrection.
 In the ende of Maister *Humes* against. D.
Will, we may see how diuerslie they thou-
 ght herein who were the defendours, yea
 the beginners of this opinion. Scarce any
 of them agree with an other, it seemeth:
 & with those of vs in England that leane
 this way, not one of the all that are stran-
 gers, doe seeme fully to consent. But whe-
 ther they doe or no, whether any of the
 olde or newe Writers say of or on, it ma-
 keth no great matter. Wee haue learned
 Christ Iesus otherwise, the to stay our ho-
 ly faith on the credit of any man, or men.

Our

The contrarie-
 vie about Chris-
 tian descending
 into Hell.

Ag. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

The contrarie-
 vie about Chris-
 tian descending
 into Hell.

Our treatise I hope before grounded wholly on Gods word, hath sufficiently cleared this point to be but a devise of me, a meer forgery, & no truth in Religion at al: yea & so much the more hatefull, as that it is urged to be taken as one of the *Articles* of faith. In which our deniall neither want we the consent of me. The *Ancients* we have noted before: the late Godly Christians are many & most famous that give their ioint consent with vs heerin. The beste reformed Churches, the *French, Dutch, Helvetian, and Scottish*, with all their most worthy and learned Pastors in them are with vs. And to speake of our selues in *England*: first all our most famous & learned Teachers in her Maiest. time have so taught, *Mr Fulk, Mr Whinakers, Mr Rainolds, Mr Deering, &c. Mr Nowel* some think holdeth contrarie. The good old Father liueth, and therefore himself can shew his own mind therein best. As for his *words that bee extant, they proue it not: Christs soule beeing separate frō his body. *descendit ad inferos*: whiche we may well interpret thus, *it went vnto the Dead, or amonge the Dead*, as wee haue shewed before that *Inferi* or *Infernum* may signifie. And speciallie we may thinke his meaning in those wordes was not against the manifest meaning of our whole **Synod*: whose doctrine was well knownen to him, and is our publike doctrine, and established by *Lawe* in *Englande*.

This

The consent of many Godlie learned in this that Christs went not properly into Hell.
* In Catech.

* Anno. 1562.

THE **THAT** **CHRIST** **WENT** **NOT**
 not I Toppole till about Mai. *Laters* time,
 when they sawe somewhat of the Popish
 etrouers heerein, but could not presently
 bee purged from all their filth. Nowe
 since that tyme diuers of our Protestants,
 though they left in deed the olde Popish
Lumbe, yet not discerning but that surely
 Christ went into *Hell* after death (because
 I thinke sundrie of the Fathers in wordes
 make shewe of some such vncouth thing)
 therefore they deuised a fresh howe this
 might be, and wherefore. Some thought
 to suffer torments there, some not to suf-
 fer in anie wise, but to triumph forsooth
 in *Hell*, and some knewe not why he went
 to *Hell*, but thither he went they thought.
 And some, that hee went and came a-
 gayne from thence presently, not staying
 two houres in *Hell*; others that he stayed
 there all the while till his Resurrection.
 In the ende of Maister *Humes* against. D.
Nill, we may see how diuerslie they thou-
 ght herein who were the defendours, yea
 the beginners of this opinion. Scarce any
 of them agree with an other, it seemeth:
 & with those of vs in England that leane
 this way, not one of the all that are stran-
 gers, doe seeme fully to consent. But whe-
 ther they doe or no, whether any of the
 olde or newe Writers say of or on, it ma-
 keth no great matter. Wee haue learned
 Christ lessotherwise, the to stay our ho-
 ly faith on the credit of any man, or men.
 Our

The contrarie-
 tie about Chri-
 stes descending
 into Hell.

The first

The second
 The third
 The fourth
 The fifth
 The sixth
 The seventh
 The eighth
 The ninth
 The tenth

Our treatise I hope before grounded wholly on Gods word, hath sufficiently cleared this point to be but a devise of me, a meer forgery, & no truth in Religion at all: yea & so much the more hatefull, as that it is urged to be taken as one of the *Articles* of faith. In which our deniall neither want we the consent of me. The *Ancients* we have noted before: the late Godly Christians are many & most famous that give their joint consent with vs heerin. The beste reformed Churches, the *French, Dutch, Helvetian, and Scottish*, with all their most worthy and learned Pastors in them are with vs. And to speake of our selues in *England*: first all our most famous & learned Teachers in her Maiest. time have so taught, *Mr Fulk, Mr Whitakers, Mr Rainolds, Mr Deering, &c.* *Mr Nowel* some think holdeth contrary. The good old Father liueth, and therefore himself can shew his own mind therein best. As for his *words that bee extant, they proue it not: Christs soule beeing separate from his body. *descendit ad inferos*: whiche we may well interpret thus, *it went vnto the Dead, or amonge the Dead*, as wee haue shewed before that *Inferi* or *Infernum* may signifie. And speciallie we may thinke his meaning in those wordes was not against the manifest meaning of our whole **Synod*: whose doctrine was well knownen to him, and is our publike doctrine, and established by *Lawe* in *Englande*.

This

The consent of many Godlie learned in this that Christs went not properly into Hell. * In Catech.

* Anno. 1562.

172 THAT CHRIST WENT NOT

The Doctrine
renewed and
established in
England is a-
gainst Christ
going into Hell
properly.

7. June 1562.

Quemadmodum
Christus pro nobis mortuus est & sepultus, ita est
etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse. Nam Cor-
pus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro iacuit,
spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus qui in carcere
sive in inferno detinebantur fuit, illisq; praeuocauit,
quemadmodum reserat Petri locus.

ad. 1. 1. 1.

This Synod apparantly renounceth this do-
ctrine of Christes going downe to the Hell
of the damned. But howe appeareth it?
Even thus: The Synod before holden in K.
Edwardes time affirmed this doctrine di-
rectly and expressely. This Synod conuining
after doth correct and amend this very
article of the former. It repeateth and ra-
tifieth parte thereof in expresse wordes:
but parte of it, euenall and euery whit
that contayneth this doctrine expressely
of Christs going down to the Hell of the
damned, all this I say, t our Synod cutteth
of, it putteth out, it casteth away. There-
fore our Synod renounceth apparantly this
sense of the Creede, that Christ descended
to the Hell of the damned. The words are
these of the former Synod: *Quemadmodum
Christus pro nobis mortuus est & sepultus, ita est
etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse. Nam Cor-
pus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro iacuit,
spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus qui in carcere
sive in inferno detinebantur fuit, illisq; praeuocauit,
quemadmodum reserat Petri locus.* In whiche
last wordes they in deede expressely deter-
mine that Christ went in his soule after
death into the Hell of the damned: and
no maruaile in them, who did but newlie
peepe out of Poperie. But our Synode
since correcteth it heerein, and saith but
thus only, *Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis
mortuus est & sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad
inferos descendisse.* As Christ dyed for vs and was buried,

It was not to believe that he went into the Dead. That he went into the *Hell* of the damned, which followed expresse in all the next wordes, this they wholly corrected, suppressed, and refused. This therefore in them is seene manifestlie (as I saide) to renounce and abrogate this particular sense of Christs descending, that he went after death into *Hell*. If any say, Our *Synod* leaueth it free to any conuenient sense, it denyeth none. First, then it is granted, as in deede it is true, they would haue none punished for holding any probable sense heerein, though he thinke not that *Christ went into Hell*. Secondly, I say this is true also and manifest by the promisses, that they leane in deede this *Article* of our *Creed* to any conuenient sense, they denie none, sauing onely this which before in *Æ. Edwardes* tyme was expresse commanded, and is here with vs specially put out. By putting it out, they denye this apparantlie. Therefore I conclude, if we note this well, it can not be denied but the publike sentence of our Churches, yea the *Lawe* of our Land confirming the same, as well as the Holy Scripture which is the *Lawe* of God, is against this opinion of Christes descending into *Hell*.

All which being duely considered, I maruaile that a man of learning and wisdom as he is thought, who hath openlie impugned this doctrine of late, would so rash-

Objection.

Answer.

The Lawe of England is against Christs going into Hell properly.
"Act of Parli.
anno Eli. 2.
Cap. 12.

The Doctrine
remained and
established in
England is a-
gainst Christes
going into Hell
properly.

9. June 1562.

Ye shall see that
the same doctrine
which was
in the first
Synode of
London
is still the same
in this Synode
of 1562.

1562. June 9.

This Synod apparantly renounceth this doctrine of Christes going downe to the Hell of the damned. But howe appeareth it? Even thus: The Synod before holden in K. Edwardes time affirmed this doctrine directly and expressly. This Synod conning after doth correct and amend this very article of the former. It repeateth and ratifieth parte thereof in expresse wordes: but parte of it, even all and euery whit that contayneth this doctrine expressly of Christs going down to the Hell of the damned, all this I say, our Synod cutteth of, it putteth out, it casteth away. Therefore our Synod renounceth apparantly this sense of the Creede, that Christ descended to the Hell of the damned. The words are these of the former Synod: *Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est & sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse. Nam Corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro iacuit, spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus qui in carcere sine in inferno detinebantur fuit, illisq; predicavit, quemadmodum testatur Petri locus.* In whiche last wordes they in deede expresse determine that Christ went in his soule after death into the Hell of the damned: and no marvaile in them, who did but newlie peepe out of Poperie. But our Synode since correcteth it heerein, and saith but thus only, *Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est & sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse.* As Christ dyed for vs and was buried.

That he went into the *Hell* of the damned, which followed expresse in all the next wordes, this they wholly corrected, suppressed, and refused. This therefore in them is seene manifestlie (as I saide) to renounce and abrogate this particular sense of Christs descending, that he went after death into *Hell*. If any say, Our Synod leaueth it free to any conuenient sense, it denyeth none. First, then it is granted, as in deede it is true, they would haue none punished for holding any probable sense heerein, though he thinke not that *Christ went into Hell*. Secondly, I say this is true also and manifest by the promisses, that they leane in deede this *Article* of our *Creed* to any conuenient sense, they denie none, sauing onely this which before in *K. Edwardes* tyme was expresse commanded, and is here with vs specially put out. By putting it out, they denye this apparantlie. Therefore I conclude, if we note this well, it can not be denied but the publike sentence of our Churches, yea the *Lawe* of our Land confirming the same, as wel as the Holy Scripture which is the *Lawe* of God, is against this opinion of Christes descending into *Hell*.

All which being duely considered, I matuaile that a man of learning and wisdom as he is thought, who hath openlie impugned this doctrine of late, would so rash-

Objection

Answer

The *Lawe* of
England is a-
gainst Christs
going into
Hell properly.
"Act of Par-
liamt. anno Eli-
z. 12.
Cap. 12.

174 **THAT CHRIST WENT NOT**
rashlie runne into these errors, and so
vainly defend them afterwarde, that hee
would rather Gods Church should bee
pitiously disturbed about them, as now it
is, then that his ill conceites should bee
kept to himselfe. And for my parte, my
trust is, that in resisting these fantasies and
notable errors of Christes suffering for
vs *only in Flesh*, and of his *Soule descending into*
Hell, labouring so strongly of Popery, and
vanitie, I haue done according to my
power without respect of persons, but
what in conscience I owe both to God,
and to his Church, & to our whole state.
And thus the Lorde in mercy will yet (I
doubt not) beate downe error, and ad-
uance his truerh still, yea euen by ma-
king things that are not to bring to
thought things that are, that
his own Name may haue
all the glorie.
Amen.

7 NO 55

2. Cor. 2. 17.

*We are not as many, which make merchandise of
the Word of God: but as of sinceritie, but as of
God, in the sight of God speake we in Christ.*

H. I.

Page. Lm.

Faultes:

Corrections.

T in margin.

9. 19.

the seed of Angels

the Angels,

9. 26.

against his own body

against his own body,

* in margin.

37. T y last

for him vs.

him for vs.

43. 31.

put out two things

48. 30.

contrarie hate

contrite hate

73. *

See pag. 49.

See pag. 50.

74. 35.

signified

signified

86. 39.

direct

object

97. 23.

homo

one

111. 15.

executed

exercised

111. 28.

former

former

111. 39.

falleth

or falleth

121. 9.

the death,

the dead,

127. 20.

the signifie

to signifie

139. 9.

attributed

not attributed

139. 10.

not of

of

31. 32.

outward indeed,

yea only his very

Death, yet &c.

50. 33.

not possible

therefore

52. 18.

willing purpose:

yea againste his

moste holy pati-

ence, & heaven-

lie fortitudes